United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.27

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
27th meeting
Wednesday, 1 November 2000, 10.00 a.m.
New York

President: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: Before proceeding with our deliberations, I should like to remind delegations again that this meeting will be adjourned at 12.30 p.m. so that the ceremony of presenting the 2000 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Certificates may take place.

As I mentioned at the meeting yesterday, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on the remaining draft resolutions as indicated in informal working paper No. 6. I propose that the Committee take action on the draft resolutions in the sequence indicated in that paper, and that at this morning's meeting, if time permits, the Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, L.4/Rev.1, L.29/Rev.1, L.39/Rev.1 and L.49/Rev.1. If there is not enough time, then draft resolution L.49/Rev.1 will be considered this afternoon. Action will be taken on all remaining draft resolutions at this afternoon's meeting.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with that proposal.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions, if any.

Mr. Keita (Mali) (*spoke in French*): The adjustments made to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11 within the framework of revisions 1 and 2 deal essentially with form. They have contributed to bringing more clarity and precision to some provisions, in particular the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 3, 7 and 8. We thought it a good idea to insert, in the last preambular paragraph, mention of the document that was adopted in document A/53/681, paragraph 4 of the annex. Changes to operative paragraphs 3, 7 and 8, are primarily clarifications.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the delegation of Egypt for its positive contribution. I will not go back over the importance of this draft resolution for our subregion, since that was covered during the introduction of the draft resolution to the Committee. My colleague from Sierra Leone last week outlined very well the impact of the illicit circulation of light weapons on the subregion in general and on Sierra Leone in particular. In addition to the countries of the subregion, I pay tribute to the following countries: Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, the Congo, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Japan and Madagascar; and to the countries of the European Union, which have kindly become sponsors of the draft resolution.

As in past years we hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

The Chairman: I now open the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-72184 (E)

comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1: nuclear weapons.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): Pakistan is committed to the realization of nuclear disarmament and the early elimination of nuclear weapons. For several years the General Assembly endorsed the fair and equitable position adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement to promote general and complete disarmament under effective international control as an ultimate objective to be attained within a specified time-frame through the elimination of all nuclear arsenals and all other weapons of mass destruction.

Unfortunately, during the past five years, since the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the momentum of international endeavours towards nuclear disarmament has, in our opinion, visibly dissipated. Some nuclear-weapon States have stated their intention to retain nuclear weapons indefinitely. The threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States is held out openly. Meanwhile, the process of nuclear disarmament is completely stalled. The Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) is yet to be implemented. The danger of a new arms race is ever present and could be sparked by a decision on or movement towards deployment of ballistic missile defence globally and regionally. The rejection of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) has not been reversed.

Under these circumstances we believe that there is no cause for the euphoria generated by the consensus arrived at during the NPT Review Conference. We are not convinced that a credible process of step-by-step nuclear disarmament is likely to be initiated in the near future, and the prospects for the elimination of nuclear weapons remain remote, if not Utopian. These harsh realities may not be very palatable to delegations sponsoring draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament and the NPT Review Conference at this year's session, but the suspension of disbelief in the context of nuclear weapons can be costly. NPT States parties, in any case, cannot seek to impose the provisions of that Treaty on States that are not parties to it.

In the eighteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution L.39/Rev.1, a call is made for efforts to implement article VI of the NPT and various steps envisaged therein. It is obvious that efforts to implement article VI of the NPT can be made only by States parties to the NPT. States that are not parties to a treaty cannot be expected to implement provisions of that treaty. We would be grateful to receive confirmation of that understanding from the sponsors of the draft resolutions.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): In the statement just made, the representative of Pakistan referred to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. I believe that he also referred to other draft resolutions. Draft resolution L.39/Rev.1 was introduced by my delegation the day before yesterday. My delegation understands that the representative of Pakistan made a general point on the legal obligation of States parties to a treaty and as such my delegation takes note of it as a statement of a fact.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, associate themselves with this statement.

The First Committee today will be taking a stand on the draft resolution dealing with the negotiations on the treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices, that is, the fissile material cut-off treaty.

The European Union would like to take advantage of this opportunity to recall the importance it attaches to negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on that treaty, which, in its view, remains a high-priority objective. These negotiations, as well as the effective implementation of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, must be another essential stage in non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. That has already been recommended by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The 2000 Review Conference reaffirmed that need. We fully support the relevant provisions of the Final Document of that Review Conference.

The European Union deplores the fact that until now it has not been possible to reach consensus at the Conference on Disarmament to authorize the commencement of those negotiations. We call upon

States parties to do everything possible to achieve that objective as quickly as possible. We hope that the adoption today by consensus of this important draft resolution will contribute to the effective launching of work in Geneva at the beginning of the 2001 session and its conclusion as soon as possible.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): For the second consecutive year the First Committee will take a decision on a draft resolution that is of great interest to the international community, given the importance and magnitude of respect for the preservation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. For a few countries the ABM Treaty is a matter of strictly bilateral interest, of concern only to those countries that have adhered to it. However, the Treaty, as is indicated by the sponsors of the draft resolution, is of historical importance and is a cornerstone for guaranteeing global peace and security. Therefore Cuba associates itself with those who have reaffirmed its validity and continuing importance, especially in the current international situation, at a time which highlights the importance of full and strict compliance with the Treaty by the parties.

Cuba has taken due note of the decision by President Clinton, who declared on 1 September that he would postpone taking a decision on the establishment of a national anti-missile defence system. The deferment of that initiative does not mean that the idea of creating an anti-missile shield has been abandoned. Studies and development of this system are even continuing. Therefore, the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1 is relevant. There is still time here to continue an appeal for respect for the spirit and letter of the ABM Treaty. The text of the draft resolution before the Committee is not confrontational and limits itself to calling for relevant actions to strengthen and reinforce the ABM Treaty.

For the reasons I have just explained, Cuba will be voting in favour of draft resolution L.2/Rev.1 and urges other delegations to firmly support it also.

Mr. Cordeiro de Pinto Andrade (Brazil): Brazil would like to explain its views on the draft resolution on which we are about to vote, as well as on the issue of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems in general. We acknowledge the bilateral nature of the ABM Treaty. Given the Treaty's role as a cornerstone of strategic stability, however, the international community has a legitimate interest in the possibility of changes to it. It is also legitimate for delegations to consider the ABM Treaty to be so important to existing disarmament arrangements that certain changes to its content may have negative repercussions on the whole disarmament architecture. In this sense we recall the principle of irreversibility of arms control and reduction measures, and we underline the ABM Treaty's key role in the present dynamics of multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Brazil is concerned at any initiative that may impact negatively on nuclear disarmament, lead to a new arms race or be inconsistent with the commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In line with the communiqué of the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the New Agenda Coalition Countries, Brazil reiterates the call on the parties to the ABM Treaty to preserve the Treaty's integrity and validity and to refrain from the implementation of measures that would undermine its purpose.

The First Committee is attentive to the impact of changes to the ABM Treaty on strategic stability, because nuclear arsenals are still robust enough to support the mutually-assured-destruction rationale. As an advocate of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, Brazil looks forward to the day the ABM Treaty will no longer be necessary.

Brazil shares many of the substantive concerns contained in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1. From a legal point of view, however, we cannot support the concept of Member States invoking for themselves the responsibility of "safeguarding the inviolability and integrity" of a bilateral treaty. Without precluding the legitimacy of the international community's interest in the issue, the responsibility belongs to the parties to the Treaty. In this regard we stress that it is important that the parties to the Treaty, when exercising the right to propose amendments, as foreseen in the Treaty, bear in mind the concerns expressed by the international community during the debate on this agenda item. Because of those legal considerations Brazil will have to maintain its abstention.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor to explain my delegation's position before the vote on

the draft resolution entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", document A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1.

During the cold war the question of nuclear deterrence was perhaps far simpler than it is today. The military and nuclear confrontation was largely between the two super Powers and their alliance systems. There were no additional nuclear-weapon States. There was no ballistic missile defence. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, by prohibiting the deployment of national missile defences, served to stabilize the balance of terror between the Eastern and Western alliances. It was presumed, if not legally prescribed, that this rationale for strategic nuclear stability would also be applied at the regional level. Unfortunately, instead of the prospects for stability through the drastic reduction of nuclear weapons and delivery systems being enhanced by the end of the cold war, we have witnessed a growing asymmetry at the strategic level in numbers of nuclear weapons and operational delivery systems, as well as in technological and financial capabilities. These systemic factors for destabilization at the strategic level are being aggravated by the political trend in the leading world Power in favour of the development and deployment of national missile defence systems as well as theatre missile defence systems.

We believe that if a decision on national missile defence deployment is taken or seems inevitable, it could have a cascading effect on international strategic stability. It could unravel several important disarmament agreements, especially the ABM Treaty. The deployment of theatre missile defence systems in certain sensitive regions would also adversely affect stability and arms control in those regions and accelerate and expand the production and deployment of missiles. That issue has serious security implications for Pakistan.

Pakistan thus shares the concerns expressed in the sixth preambular paragraph that undermining the ABM Treaty will affect international peace and stability. We endorse the call in operative paragraph 1 for steps to strengthen the ABM Treaty and preserve its integrity and validity, and in operative paragraph 2 for renewed efforts to preserve and strengthen the Treaty through full compliance. Furthermore, Pakistan strongly supports the call in operative paragraph 3 to limit the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems and would have wished that the call had been universal and had envisaged the total non-deployment of all anti-ballistic missile systems, as did the Sino-Russian statement of 18 July 2000, which stated that non-strategic missile defence cooperation in this field, though not prohibited under the ABM Treaty, should nevertheless not be permitted to prejudice the security interests of other countries or undermine global and regional stability and security. As we have said, strategic stability should not be preserved at the cost of regional stability and security. That will be the consequence if theatre missile defence systems are supplied, developed or deployed in certain regions of the world, including South Asia.

The development and deployment of ballistic missile defence systems, both national and theatre, are being justified by portraying them as a response to missile proliferation in the developing countries. That premise is both unacceptable and unjustifiable. It is unacceptable because it is discriminatory; double standards should not be imposed in the missile field as they have been in the nuclear field. It is unjustified because the missile capabilities of the developing countries are nowhere near the point where they could pose even a remote security threat to the advanced nuclear and other militarily significant States. In fact, concerns about missile proliferation are being raised precisely to justify the imposition of inequality on the developing countries and to justify the development and deployment of national missile defence and theatre missile defence systems. Therefore the delegation of Pakistan is disappointed that the sponsors of draft resolution L.2/Rev.1 have included a preambular paragraph that gives voice to this so-called concern about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

Pakistan shares the central objective of the draft resolution, that is, to maintain global and regional peace and stability by avoiding the deployment of ballistic missile defence systems, both national and theatre. We will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. Mukul (India): As it did last year, India will vote for the draft resolution entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, as the issues it emphasizes remain fully valid today. Our position on the subject has already been spelled out in the general statement by the Indian delegation in the First Committee. We wish to reaffirm the

importance of full implementation, in good faith, of all existing bilateral and multilateral arms control treaties, including the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the ABM Treaty.

Mr. Grey (United States): Recently a new version was issued of the draft resolution entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems". I have asked for the floor to make clear why my country cannot support that draft resolution as revised.

A new paragraph was added welcoming President Clinton's 1 September decision not to deploy a national missile defence at this time. That change only makes the draft resolution worse. The sponsors have essentially ignored the President's decision by failing to make any other changes to the draft resolution to take into account how the President's decision has changed the landscape on anti-ballistic missile (ABM) issues. Moreover, the change that was made does not remedy the basic flaws that caused the United States to oppose this initiative from the beginning. The draft resolution remains based on the premise that preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty is incompatible with amending it. That is a peculiar view to take of a Treaty that specifically provides a mechanism — the Standing Consultative Commission — for considering proposals for further increasing the viability of the Treaty, including proposals for amendments. As is well known, the ABM Treaty has already been amended.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1 continues to place the United Nations General Assembly in the position of taking sides in ongoing discussions between the United States and Russia and making judgements about substantive issues in these discussions. Let me repeat, questions about the ABM Treaty are for the Treaty parties to resolve. That process will only be hindered by having the General Assembly take sides. The United States strongly urges other delegations not to support draft resolution L.2/Rev.1.

Mr. Ogunbanwo (Nigeria): My delegation has taken the floor to explain its vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1. I should like to begin by highlighting the factors that underline the fundamental significance of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the ABM Treaty. Those factors include the following. First, although the ABM Treaty is a bilateral agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation, its implementation has implications for existing bilateral and multilateral disarmament efforts. Secondly, it is the global cornerstone of strategic stability. Thirdly, it remains the basis for promoting further reductions of strategic nuclear weapons, and fourthly, it has for 28 years stood the test of time and has preserved the confidence of both parties in the Treaty itself. My delegation therefore hopes that these weighty factors will be paramount in the minds of the States concerned as they try to resolve the differences that have arisen between the United States and the Russian Federation regarding the bilateral ABM Treaty.

In this connection, my delegation welcomes the recent decision of the United States to postpone the deployment of a national missile defence system. We consider that decision to be a positive step. In fact, my delegation thinks that it has opened a window of opportunity to address the concerns of the international community. Let us seize this opportunity to urge the United States and the Russian Federation to resume their dialogue, taking into account the need to preserve the ABM Treaty. The future of the ABM Treaty, which is the foundation of strategic stability, should not continue to be called into question. My delegation continues to believe that the way forward is for a negotiated settlement of problems related to the ABM Treaty.

Nigeria shares some of the objectives contained in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1. However, we believe that the Committee should be offering words of encouragement to the parties concerned so that they can get together to resolve outstanding questions. Consistent with our view that dialogue and cooperation, especially between the two major nuclear Powers, are critical elements for achieving disarmament agreement, my delegation will abstain.

On a related development, my delegation is concerned about the issue of ballistic missiles whose technology has been acquired by an increasing number of countries. In this connection my delegation supports the view that recent developments in the field of ballistic missiles and missile defences have underscored the urgent need for multilaterally negotiated norms. A first step towards such multilaterally negotiated norms is the comprehensive study on missiles which the Secretary-General is exhorted to prepare with the assistance of governmental experts.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): In common with all other countries in the United Nations concerned about the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the ABM Treaty, because it maintains stability and a global strategic balance and represents an important part of both bilateral and multilateral disarmament agreements, Syria calls for full and strict compliance with the provisions of that important Treaty. The language used in the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1 is far removed from the main objective of the draft resolution and takes away from the desired objective. We think that the language in these two paragraphs encourages violation of the ABM Treaty. Therefore, in practice it contradicts the objective of the draft resolution under discussion. This prompts my delegation to register its strong reservation about the contents of those two paragraphs.

However, despite the strong reservations to which we have already referred, because of our keen interest in a global strategic balance and stability and the importance of respecting international treaties concluded at different levels, we will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Aliyev (Azerbaijan): Our delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, given the significance of the ABM Treaty, in particular its article IX which provides that each participating State shall not deploy outside its national territory ABM systems or their components limited by the Treaty.

Mr. Maquieira (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems — the ABM Treaty — is recognized as being the cornerstone of the maintenance of strategic stability and the basis for the future reduction of offensive nuclear weapons. It has been playing a fundamental role in guaranteeing international peace and security, in which its clear universal objective has been evident. That being the case, it is our belief that any measure that may well weaken the integrity and validity of the Treaty would affect the stability and security of the entire international community.

We therefore express our concern at the danger of the development and installation of an anti-ballistic missile system and the search for military technology that can be used in outer space. That, among other aspects, would contribute to the erosion of a world climate favourable to disarmament and international security. We issue an alert as to the negative consequences that could result if this situation endures. Its destabilizing effects could give impetus to a new arms race, thereby endangering non-proliferation and weakening arms control regimes. Nevertheless, we shall abstain in the voting on this draft resolution in the hope that the parties to the Treaty can reach an understanding on its preservation and observance.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): Although the Philippines values the importance the sponsors and other delegations give to the preservation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, we shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. Like many other delegations, the Philippines believes that the ABM Treaty has served to secure the critical strategic balance that kept the world intact during the cold war and even after. The Philippines also believes that the draft resolution before the Committee contains many elements that reflect other important concerns. We welcome in particular the recognition in the draft resolution of the decision taken by the United States Government to postpone the decision on deploying a national missile defence system, a decision which was announced shortly before the Millennium Summit and which caused several delegations to frantically redraft statements and talking points.

The Philippines agrees that the ABM Treaty is an issue of urgent concern for us all. However, the Philippines also believes that it may not yet be the time to be actively involved in this issue, one which the Philippines believes can better be settled among the States parties to the Treaty. The Philippines does not agree, either, with the proposition that the General Assembly can tell States parties not to amend the Treaty when the Treaty itself allows for amendments. That is a basic concern that has certain implications in terms of general treaty relations for the Philippines and perhaps for others as well.

It is also possible that keeping dialogue open on the issue of the ABM Treaty and national missile defence can have welcome dividends. States that might be thinking of proliferating weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems might actually have thought twice about expending effort and resources when it could all prove futile. That may be too speculative and difficult to prove with certainty, but there have been some dramatic and positive

developments in our region that we hope, through our common diplomatic and political efforts, as well as the goodwill of all parties concerned, will further decrease the possibility of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. In strengthening our own efforts at addressing these issues at a political and diplomatic level, we hope that the issue of missile defence systems will eventually become a moot one.

I should like to reiterate that the Philippines supports the ABM Treaty and all that it has done for us and that the action taken today by my delegation should not in any way reflect any derogation from this consistent national position.

Ms. Tohtohodjaeva (Kyrgyzstan) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to make a small correction. The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic is aware of the historic significance of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems of 26 May 1972 as a cornerstone for the maintenance of global peace and security and strategic stability. The Government reaffirms that under current international conditions this Treaty is as significant as it has always been. In that connection, on behalf of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, allow me to declare the decision of my country to associate itself with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems".

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution itself.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Uganda, Ukraine, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted by 78 votes to 3, with 65 abstentions.

[The delegation of Turkmenistan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Seibert (Germany): I have the honour to speak on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom, and would like to explain why we decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems".

We believe that the way in which this matter is dealt with in the First Committee should have the support of the parties to the Treaty. This year, as last year, we have underlined the need for consensus on this resolution. We regret that it was not possible for the parties to reach an agreement, and we encourage them to continue their discussions on the issue. We attach great importance to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability contributing to the broader disarmament and arms control process. Both the Russian Federation and the United States have reaffirmed in their statements their commitment to the ABM Treaty and to the continuation of their efforts to strengthen it in order to enhance its viability and effectiveness in the future. We welcome these commitments and urge the parties to continue their cooperation on this basis.

We welcome the decision by the President of the United States of America not to authorize at this stage the deployment of a limited national missile defence. We also welcome the agreement recently reached in New York by the President of the United States and the President of the Russian Federation on a strategic stability cooperation agreement, as well as the intensified discussions on further reductions in strategic offensive forces within the framework of a future START III treaty. We underline the importance of further progress in bilateral nuclear disarmament efforts also in view of advancing wider multilateral efforts in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We urge the parties to continue with the bilateral process in this field, including the early entry into force of the Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) and the early commencement of START III negotiations on further significant reductions of nuclear arsenals and their conclusion as soon as possible.

As the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons provides the global framework for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, we strongly welcome the successful outcome of the 2000 Review Conference. We underline the importance of the implementation of the practical steps agreed in the Final Document of the Review Conference, including the continuation of the START process and the urgency of the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, as well as the necessity of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. We recognize the increasing security challenges caused by the ongoing proliferation of ballistic missile systems capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction and the need to prevent and curb such proliferation through international endeavours.

Mr. Salander (Sweden): Sweden aligns itself with the comments on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1 made by Germany on behalf of 29 States. Over and above these points, Sweden would like to clarify its position on one issue.

While fully sharing the concern at the possible effects on disarmament and non-proliferation of unilateral actions related to the possible deployment of a national missile defence system, Sweden does not share the overriding preoccupation with strategic stability expressed in the draft resolution. The concept of strategic stability is closely linked with cold war doctrines which, while they have formed an important part of traditional arms control negotiations, should, in Sweden's view, not be the sole basis for disarmament and non-proliferation in the post-cold-war era. Those should, to a greater extent, be based on agreements such as those reached at the recent Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

These views, as well as the points raised by Germany, motivated Sweden's abstention on the draft resolution.

The Chairman: At this stage I should like to welcome to the Committee the President of the Millennium Assembly. We have a very busy day today and I am sure you, Mr. President, will witness very interesting voting and lively discussion. The proceedings are also going very smoothly. I thank the President for gracing the Committee with his presence this morning.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", because it holds the principled position that global strategic stability, which is the cornerstone of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, needs to be preserved at all costs.

This landmark Treaty, although negotiated bilaterally, is the Treaty that tries to limit defensive anti-nuclear systems. It is beyond any doubt that defensive build-ups can even offset the offensive balance and hence give rise to destabilization. Therefore, in the opinion of my delegation this strategic balance has to be maintained, for its loss can have a chain effect impacting negatively on sincere efforts towards nuclear disarmament.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems".

Argentina places a great deal of importance on the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and other agreements among countries possessing nuclear weapons likely to promote general and complete nuclear disarmament. We are concerned at the lack of progress in this particular area in recent times on the part of nations possessing nuclear weapons, which is exemplified by the lack of progress in the ratification of the Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) and the START III negotiations.

There would be much more cause for concern if we saw a falling back in the agreements in force, such as the ABM Treaty. We believe that the international community has a legitimate concern in this regard.

For these reasons we repeat here the call we made bilaterally to the countries involved to redouble their efforts to strengthen existing agreements and move forward with new agreements in order to ensure that they are in full compliance with their obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Nevertheless, Argentina abstained in the vote on this draft resolution because we are not persuaded that it contributes to the creation of a favourable climate for attaining the stated objectives.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", after the most careful consideration. Over the past year international concern has sharpened in relation to missile proliferation and the national missile defence plans of the United States, now deferred but not cancelled, and their impact on the multilateral disarmament agenda, including prospects for the implementation of the commitments to nuclear disarmament agreed at the Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). New Zealand welcomes the decision by the President of the United States to defer a decision to deploy a national missile defence system and to continue the process of consultation with the international community on the question. But New Zealand's strong caution about deployment of national missile defence remains, and is based on its concern that it has the potential to have a negative impact on nuclear disarmament efforts.

I am making this explanation of vote to ensure there is no misunderstanding of the rationale of New Zealand's position. The New Zealand Government's views on the subject of missile proliferation and missile defence were delivered to a forum in New York last month by the Prime Minister. I want to conclude by quoting from her statement.

> "New Zealand's concern about the deployment of the national missile defence system is that it could retard or even unravel nuclear disarmament efforts. We believe that the front-line defence against delivery of long-range missiles of weapons of mass destruction lies in strengthening implementation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and its supporting regime, in full implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, in an effective verification regime for the Biological Weapons Convention, and in strict control of access to missile technology and components.
>
> "The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty contains the obligation to negotiate nuclear disarmament. New Zealand strongly cautions against any act which could bring current bilateral and multilateral efforts to a halt and harm existing arms control treaties. While all countries have a stake in global security, we

believe that the most powerful nations have a special duty to act with care and prudence and with a strong sense of responsibility for the consequences of their actions."

Mr. Salazar (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru abstained in the vote on the draft resolution after a great deal of thought. That draft asked us to take a position on a substantive issue in the strategic relationship between two countries with major nuclear arsenals, which has a significant impact on the security of the entire international community, in particular because it signifies a pause in the effort to limit the nuclear-arms race and a consequent reduction of the nuclear danger. Peru hopes that the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the ABM Treaty, can be strengthened because of the favourable impact it has on the rest of the international community. In relative terms it reduces the nuclear danger, and that affects us all.

The current concept underlying the strategic equilibrium should be thoroughly revised along the lines of resolutions that demand total nuclear disarmament and that we will likely approve during this session, as we did in the past, taking into consideration the results of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. The delegation of Peru welcomes the decision of the Clinton Administration to postpone its strategic defence initiative, which could require a revision of the ABM Treaty — which is exclusively a privilege of the parties — but it could lead to a repeal of the Treaty, but not to its strengthening.

Mr. Osei (Ghana): Ghana abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1, as it did on a similar resolution last year primarily, because we believe that the international community should be encouraging the parties to cooperate at the bilateral level in resolving differences about the preservation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, the ABM Treaty, which, as we all agree, remains the cornerstone for preserving global peace and stability. We consider that such a process of dialogue, which is indeed under way, should be sustained by the Treaty parties and, if so sustained, would have a salutary effect on efforts to preserve the objectives of the Treaty.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1.

I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", has a number of aspects which do not correspond with the positions that Cuba has maintained and will continue to maintain on nuclear disarmament. We have reservations about a number of paragraphs in the draft resolution, including the fifteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 16. My delegation will abstain in the separate vote on those two paragraphs of the draft resolution.

With respect to the fifteenth preambular paragraph, Cuba's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on the outcome of the sixth Review Conference of the Treaty is well known, so I will not repeat it here.

On the matter of the whole question of security assurances dealt with in operative paragraph 16 of the draft resolution, I repeat that the security assurances to non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be universal, unconditional and non-discriminatory. Cuba cannot accept that such assurances should be granted only to States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Our country, as a non-nuclear State and one that has put all its nuclear installations under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, has a right to full security assurances from nuclear States independently of its status as a party or non-party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Despite our reservations on these and other paragraphs in draft resolution L.4/Rev.1, Cuba has decided to vote in favour of the text as a whole. That decision is the outcome of a very careful analysis which took various factors into account, especially the fact that we consider that this draft resolution, despite its inconsistencies and limitations, could make an additional contribution to promoting the priority objective which Cuba has in the area of disarmament: the achievement of nuclear disarmament. The sole fact that this draft resolution puts forth the need for a world free from nuclear armaments and sets out a certain number of clear steps to make progress in that direction

gives it merits of its own, which we acknowledge and encourage. We hope for the realization of these good intentions, which we know motivate the sponsors of this text, in order to move towards the objective of nuclear disarmament. This is the objective shared by the immense majority of the States represented here. We have no option but to work together and in a constructive spirit in order to move towards nuclear disarmament, independently of our differences as to the ways and means of doing so.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation is taking the floor to explain its position before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1. The draft resolution this year has incorporated numerous elements from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. A statement made in the thematic debate on 23 October 2000 spells out our position on the NPT Review Conference.

One of the preambular paragraphs mentions the question of status. I wish to state once again that we have never asked for any special status but that we should continue to maintain our ability to deter nuclear or other aggression from any quarter. Paradoxically, the provisions of this preambular paragraph may have the opposite effect to what it may be trying to achieve. In any case, this paragraph indirectly implies that certain States do have a special status to continue to possess nuclear weapons. That is a strange proposition to be included in a draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world".

In particular, my delegation strongly opposes unrealistic demands contained in operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution. We had suggested some modifications to the sponsors to at least make provisions of operative paragraph 13 an integral part of the process of nuclear disarmament envisaged in the preceding paragraph. Unfortunately, those suggestions were not taken on board by the sponsors. On the contrary, the draft resolution in its revised form has become even more unacceptable to my delegation. For these reasons the Pakistan delegation is constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its position before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda".

The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, remains the only consensus document on disarmament adopted by the international community as a whole. The Final Document contains a Programme of Action which remains only partially implemented. Any agenda for the future would necessarily have to take into account as the starting premise the implementation of the Programme of Action from the tenth special session. It would be evident that on the most important element, nuclear disarmament, the international community has made little progress. The question we need to ask is whether there is a need for a new agenda at all, when the most important element in the existing agenda remains valid and yet to be accomplished.

We understand the genesis of the draft resolution, which began with the joint declaration issued in Dublin on behalf of eight countries in June 1998. India welcomed that declaration. However, this draft resolution this year not only goes far beyond the parameters of the joint declaration but has been totally changed and cast in the framework of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), a framework and agenda that is as old as 1967. The draft resolution includes extraneous elements and formulations that were adopted in other forums. We reject descriptive approaches concerning security issues, such as those contained in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 13, 14 and 17, that are not only irrelevant to this draft resolution but are also fictional, being completely divorced from the reality on the ground. India no longer has a nuclear-weapons option. That option has been exercised and India is a nuclear-weapon State. We do not seek conferment of this status, nor is it a status for others to grant. It is a reality that cannot be denied, a reality that any realistic agenda has to factor in.

The reference in operative paragraph 17 to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia not only borders on the unreal but also calls into question one of the fundamental guiding principles for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, namely, that arrangements for such zones should be freely arrived at among States of the region concerned. That principle was again endorsed by consensus in the United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines last year. As we have stated on other occasions, given current realities, the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-

free zone in South Asia is no more valid than nuclear-weapon-free zones in East Asia, Western Europe or North America.

Given the omnibus nature of the draft resolution, there is a surprising lack of any mention of the doctrine of first use of nuclear weapons. The nuclear doctrine of the only remaining transcontinental multilateral alliance, whose security policy is predicated on nuclear weapons, reaffirmed its policy of first use of nuclear weapons. Similarly, the draft resolution ignores efforts in certain countries to refine and modernize nuclear weapons for retention well into the new century. Even the specific references to interim measures such as de-alerting and the removal of nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles have been deleted from the draft resolution in an evident attempt to appease the nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT. Ongoing efforts to build ballistic missile defences could well have the effect of further eroding an international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security. Instead of emphasizing the gravity of these actions, which imperil the entire fabric of multilateral disarmament efforts, the draft resolution has recast most paragraphs to make them more palatable to the nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT.

My delegation's views on the NPT are well known. The draft resolution attempts to revive the sagging fortunes of a treaty that has disappointed the vast majority of its States parties. We sympathize with those who have been striving in vain over the years to get the five self-anointed nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT to accept concrete steps towards nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution is silent on the multifarious sources of proliferation that the NPT has failed to stem. We believe that all such efforts, however worthy and energetic, are limited by the intrinsic inequality and discriminatory framework of obligations enshrined in the NPT.

As we have maintained, any new agenda cannot succeed in the old framework of the NPT. The sponsors of the draft resolution this year appear to be reverting to the old agenda in the old framework that is bound to be unsuccessful. The need therefore is to move beyond the old framework towards a durable system of international security, based on the principles of equal and legitimate security for all. We expected that the draft resolution would include proposals contained in Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) documents starting from the Durban summit, given that a number of sponsors are also members of NAM. The NAM positions include concrete proposals for a nuclear-weapon-free world, particularly the call for an international conference with the objective of reaching agreement on the phased elimination of nuclear weapons. We would also have preferred that the use of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, be designated as a crime against humanity within the purview of the International Criminal Court.

Finally, although my delegation also shares the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the need to work for a nuclear-weapon-free world, we remain unconvinced of the utility of an exercise bound by the flawed and discriminatory approaches of the NPT. We will therefore cast a negative vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): Allow me to make a brief comment on the translation into French of the draft resolution. My delegation cannot accept the French translation of the wording in the draft resolution on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). After consultation among the interested parties, the Secretariat about two weeks ago issued a corrigendum in which the English expression "dealing with nuclear disarmament" in the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference is translated into French as "chargé du désarmement nucléaire". I therefore am asking that this correction be respected in the French text of document A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1.

I conclude by recalling that France attaches great importance to the equal validity of the six official languages of the United Nations.

The Chairman: The statement by the representative of France has been duly noted.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested. Separate votes have also been requested on the fifteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 16.

The Committee will now take a decision on the fifteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution L.4/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Kuwait have become sponsors.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on the fifteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution L.4/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "*Welcoming* the Final Document of the Sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Cuba

The fifteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 was retained by 151 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 16 of draft resolution L.4/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "16. *Notes* that the Sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons agreed that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear-weapon States to the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and that it called upon its Preparatory Committee to make recommendations to the 2005 Review Conference on this issue;".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana,

Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, India, Israel, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 was retained by 151 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russian Federation, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 146 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the vote.

Mr. Cheng Jinye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, in part because it draws extensively upon the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Also, China advocates the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, which is consistent with the thrust and objectives of draft resolution L.4/Rev.1, put forward by the New Agenda Coalition. Therefore China supports the draft resolution.

At the same time, in our view the draft resolution could be improved in the following ways. First, the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems — the ABM Treaty — is the cornerstone for safeguarding international strategic balance and stability, for advancing nuclear disarmament and for preventing nuclear proliferation. We have taken note of the reference in draft resolution L.4/Rev.1 to the importance of the ABM Treaty. At the same time, we consider that the draft resolution should be able to take a more explicit stance.

Secondly, the country possessing the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals in the world should take the lead in continuing to drastically reduce its nuclear weapons. In our view, the draft resolution can also be further strengthened in this regard. In connection with mention in the draft resolution of measures for nuclear transparency, we consider that the adoption of these measures should be conditional upon a larger international environment of peace, security, stability and trust. It should have a link with the nuclear disarmament process and must have as its premise the undiminished security of the countries concerned.

It is also necessary to mention that the draft resolution should clearly call upon nuclear-weapon States to undertake not to be the first to use, or to threaten to use, nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or in nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. Grey (United States): The United States is pleased that this year the sponsors presented a draft resolution which, with its revisions, we have been able, broadly, to support. I can assure the Committee that we did not come to this decision easily. We reviewed the draft resolution against the Final Document of this year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is our guiding light for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament efforts.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 has wisely focused on the agenda charted in 1995 at the NPT Review and Extension Conference and supplemented by the decisions taken at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Draft resolution L.4/Rev.1 recognizes that nuclear disarmament is a process that requires pragmatic proposals in a step-like process, not political calls from possible goals. We view the draft resolution in this context, including the rather unclear and ambiguous operative paragraph 18, which should not be construed as in any way limiting the ways and means available to pursue our shared objectives. The nuclear disarmament path has included, and will continue to include, the negotiation of additional treaties and agreements, as well as unilateral initiatives which reflect national and international security and stability concerns. It is these incremental but vital steps that may most successfully bring us to a world free of nuclear weapons.

Many steps towards nuclear disarmament have already been taken, including, *inter alia*, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the INF and START treaties, the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, and the recently agreed Plutonium Disposition Agreement between Russia and the United States. A fissile material cut-off treaty is the next logical step on this path, and we look forward to the immediate commencement of negotiations on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament at the outset of its next session.

Hard work by all parties at the 2000 NPT Review Conference this past spring resulted in the first consensus NPT Review Conference Final Document in years. It is most unfortunate that rather than turning to this consensus outcome for language to include in the fourth preambular paragraph, the sponsors instead

turned to earlier proposals inconsistent with the NPT Final Document. United States support for A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 does not reflect an acceptance of this misleading paragraph but rather our overall support for the results of the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Mr. Sungar (Turkey): As a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and other international agreements in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, Turkey desires that all countries come to share the goals of non-proliferation and work collectively towards their achievement. We continue to believe that systematic and progressive efforts by nuclear-weapon States are essential to the reduction of nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons within the framework of general and complete disarmament. Since last year's resolution contained certain elements that made it difficult for us to support, we opted to abstain and to explain our reasons for doing so. This year, however, we changed our vote to yes, as the draft resolution in question properly reflects the consensus outcome agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom): I have asked for the floor to set out the United Kingdom's approach to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1. May I begin by thanking the sponsors of the draft resolution for the constructive spirit in which they have engaged in dialogue with other delegations on this text.

As I made clear at the outset of voting on draft resolutions in cluster 1, on nuclear disarmament, the United Kingdom's main concern has been that at this session the General Assembly should give its strong and unambiguous support to the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We therefore considered it particularly important that draft resolutions emerging from this Committee should faithfully reflect the letter and the spirit of what we, as parties to that Treaty, agreed here earlier this year. With that in mind, we are pleased to have been able to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

As we made clear here in May, the United Kingdom is unequivocally committed to the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We welcome the fact that the 2000 NPT Review Conference endorsed a package of measures that are reflected in this draft resolution, many of which the United Kingdom has undertaken nationally. The United Kingdom has already made substantial unilateral reductions in its nuclear arsenal and now has fewer nuclear weapons than any other nuclear-weapon State. Trident operates at a reduced state of readiness. We are fully committed to transparency about our nuclear forces. We are consistent with our non-proliferation obligations under article I of the NPT and with our national security requirements. Nuclear weapons already play a reduced role in the security policies of the United Kingdom and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and stopped producing fissile material for use in nuclear weapons. Fissile material no longer required for military purposes is being placed under international supervision. All enrichment and reprocessing facilities in the United Kingdom are subject to international inspection.

We believe the immediate priorities for further action are further reductions in the United States and Russian nuclear arsenals through the START process, the entry into force of the CTBT and the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty. These have been the agreed priorities of the international community in the nuclear disarmament field since at least 1995. They will make the world a safer place and thereby also help to create the necessary conditions for further national and international steps towards nuclear disarmament.

Clearly the achievement of the global elimination of nuclear weapons will require the United Kingdom and the other nuclear-weapon States to do more. We will continue to work with the other nuclear-weapon States in the spirit of our joint statements to the 2000 NPT Review Conference and the meetings of its Preparatory Committee. But we cannot pretend that nuclear disarmament measures can be carried forward in a security vacuum. Creating the conditions to make possible the global elimination of nuclear weapons will require action from all States, not just the five nuclear-weapon States, and across the whole global security agenda. This must include further progress on conventional armaments and on biological and chemical issues as well as in the nuclear field.

The United Kingdom set out its views on this issue in more detail in a "food for thought" paper put forward at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. In this context, we attach particular importance to the development of credible and robust international

verification arrangements. Developing solutions to the complex challenges these raise is likely to be a lengthy process and will require a deep and continuing commitment by all States.

Mr. Antonov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to explain the vote of the Russian delegation on the draft resolution just adopted. First, we cannot fail to note the significant efforts of the delegations of the non-nuclear coalition in preparing the draft. It is clear that those countries have done a great deal of work and have made broad use of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We note with satisfaction that the draft resolution welcomes Russia's ratification of the Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) and emphasizes that the completion of the ratification of this Treaty by the other side is a priority. It highlights the indissoluble link between the implementation of START II the preservation and strengthening of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, while recognizing the latter as a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons.

At the same time, we cannot fail to note that the draft resolution, in our assessment, has clearly misplaced the emphasis that was expressed in the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference. We even have questions regarding the title of the draft resolution, particularly in view of the success of the NPT Review Conference, which clearly defined the agenda for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We have also noticed discrepancies between several countries of the non-nuclear coalition regarding problems of strategic stability, the basis of which is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. That means there are also divergences regarding the conditions in which further disarmament will be possible.

Thus, we believe that the adoption of this draft resolution could create the erroneous impression that we are taking a step towards the results of the work already done by all delegations that took part in drawing up the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference. Here I should like to emphasize that the major objective of the NPT parties was the full implementation of all decisions of the Conference, not merely of some of them. The shortcomings of the draft did not allow us to vote in favour of it.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): The First Committee has been called upon for the third year in a row to take a decision on a draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", this year contained in document A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1. As the Committee knows, at the fifty-third and fifty-fourth sessions France voted against these draft resolutions, which in France's view seemed to call into question the priorities of nuclear disarmament in multilateral forums. Some of the difficulties that my country highlighted at that time remain, in particular with regard to the call in the title for "a new agenda" barely six months after the adoption of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

My country is genuinely interested in responding to the desire of the sponsors of the draft resolution to reflect as clearly as possible the consensus achieved on the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference last May. It seems to us, however, that the text before the Committee today does not fully satisfy the need for fidelity to the document that was agreed upon on May, a need on which we all concur.

Allow me to clarify the position of my country on this fundamental issue. I should like to emphasize that there is not the slightest ambiguity concerning France's commitment to the objective of eliminating nuclear weapons, as spelled out in article VI of the NPT and reaffirmed in decision 2 of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and in paragraph 15 (2) of the section on article VI contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference.

Two of the concrete measures put forward in the Final Document — the unequivocal commitment of nuclear-weapon States to achieve the elimination of these weapons, and the reaffirmation that the objective of the efforts of all for disarmament is general and complete disarmament — are of a specific nature. These two measures define the global position to be adopted by all States parties to the NPT. For France these two measures are indivisible.

However, the draft resolution adopted today does not, from our point of view, reflect this balance. While the other concrete measures on the list from the Final

Document of the 2000 Review Conference are reproduced in the form of separate points in the operative part, the unequivocal commitment of nuclear-weapon-free States is taken out of context and presented in the preambular part as a general principle. That step affects the balance of the NPT, all the more so since that paragraph is followed by another one calling for action to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. Thus, the elimination of nuclear weapons is not placed within the context of general and complete disarmament.

We believe that this presentation tends to change the scope of article VI of the NPT in ways that are not likely to strengthen the contribution of disarmament to the maintenance of peace and international stability and to the preservation of the security of all. My country does not wish to support that interpretation. France, while fully determined to fulfil all its commitments in the disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation field, including the recommendations of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, therefore had no choice but to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Chang Man-Soon (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1. Last year we abstained in the voting on the corresponding draft resolution. We have continuously supported international efforts to achieve the ultimate goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We also believe that a combination of multiple bilateral and multilateral efforts, as well as unilateral undertakings, can bring about concrete results on the road to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. That is why my delegation put more emphasis on a practical and incremental approach to nuclear disarmament. Accordingly, my delegation is of the view that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1 is much more in line with our aforementioned basic perspective on nuclear disarmament than last year's draft resolution. In addition, the language of the draft resolution is more balanced, reflecting the compromise language of the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting I would like to ask delegations to remain in the Conference room for the ceremony of the presentation of the 2000 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Certificates.

At this afternoon's meeting the Committee will take action on all remaining draft resolutions so as to conclude its work for the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

A/C.1/55/PV.28

Readex
Fiche

United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.28

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
28th meeting
Wednesday, 1 November 2000, 3 p.m.
New York

President: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As delegations were informed at this morning's meeting of the Committee, this afternoon the Committee will take action on all remaining draft resolutions appearing in informal working paper No. 6, in the sequence indicated in that informal working paper, with the exception of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.1, which will be considered after action has been taken on the other draft resolutions because the parties concerned are still carrying out consultations.

We shall start, therefore, with draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 before a decision is taken.

I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I am sorry to revert to this, but once again the translation into French of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 is not satisfactory. It is not consistent with the corrigendum.

The Chairman: The statement by the representative of France has been duly noted.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt wishes to explain its vote on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Operative paragraph 8 of that text stresses the need to strengthen policies relating to the control of exports and the technology of delivery, which consolidates the discriminatory treatment of the matter at hand, and also promotes the policies on exports in a way that does not take into account the comprehensive nature of this text. Egypt considers that the treatment of the issue of means or systems of delivery must be on a non-discriminatory basis and must address the issue in all its manifestations. It should not in any way be exclusive to non-proliferation.

For that reason the delegation of Egypt will vote against operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am not speaking to explain Syria's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. Rather, I wish to point out — as we pointed out to the sponsors of the draft resolution — that operative paragraph 8 in the Arabic text does not reflect accurately the corresponding paragraph in the English text.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-31924 (E)

Accordingly, we ask the Secretariat to make sure that the Arabic text accurately and precisely reflects the full meaning of the original English text of operative paragraph 8 as it stands.

The Chairman: The request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has been duly noted.

Mr. Thamrin (Indonesia): I have asked for the floor to explain my delegation's position before the vote with regard to operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". We consider that paragraph to be important because it refers to some important issues and arrangements, such as the need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, including their means of delivery, as well as the need for countries to adopt policies not to transfer equipment, materials or technology that could contribute to the proliferation of those weapons.

Indonesia has long supported collective international attempts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We believe that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is one of the most important pillars for this purpose. We further believe that regional initiatives such as the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world play an important role in that regard.

In promoting the goal of non-proliferation, Indonesia underscores the importance for all States parties to honour and fully implement all obligations stipulated in the NPT. Indonesia fully believes that security challenges relating to non-proliferation could not be met with selective and exclusive approaches consisting mainly of technology-denial regimes. In this regard, we consider that some of the wording found in operative paragraph 8 tends to justify such technology-denial regimes. Therefore, we will abstain in the voting on paragraph 8.

As regards the draft resolution as a whole, however, we will vote in favour because we recognize that many important points are contained in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1.

A separate vote on operative paragraph 8 has also been requested.

The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 8 which reads as follows:

> "*Calls upon* all States to redouble their efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, including their means of delivery, confirming and strengthening, if necessary, their policies not to transfer equipment, materials or technology that could contribute to the proliferation of those weapons".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Egypt, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Algeria, Benin, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Monaco, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 was retained by 137 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, France, Israel, Mauritius, Monaco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 144 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The position of the Chinese delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 is basically in support of the main objective of the draft resolution. We note also that it quotes the relevant wording of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the

Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). However, we consider that this draft resolution, like the resolution last year, still has certain inadequacies.

First, this document fails to mention certain main principles and measures that are indispensable for the promotion of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, such as the following: those who have the biggest and most advanced nuclear arsenals possess special responsibilities for engaging in nuclear disarmament; the imperative to abandon the policy and practice of a nuclear deterrence strategy characterized by the first use of nuclear weapons; and the abandonment of the policy and practice of the provision of a nuclear umbrella and nuclear sharing.

Secondly, the draft resolution provides that the negotiations on a cut-off treaty should be concluded by the year 2005. We have noted that this is somewhat different from the relevant wording contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The Chinese delegation supports the launching of early negotiations with a view to concluding a cut-off treaty. However, the launching of these negotiations and their progress are directly related to the prevailing international security environment. The artificial specification of deadlines for these negotiations, in total disregard of developments in international security, is unreasonable and unrealistic.

Lastly, we do not agree with the mention of the report of the Tokyo Forum, for many of the formulations and elements of that report are impractical and unreasonable.

For the aforementioned reasons, we abstained in the voting.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My delegation finds several provisions of the draft resolution unacceptable. The draft resolution places inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation rather than nuclear disarmament. We wish to state once again for the record that we are totally against operative paragraph 8 of the resolution. We are, however, grateful to the sponsors of the resolution for their constructive engagement and their decision to revise operative paragraph 9 appropriately.

Pakistan cannot endorse the provisions of most of the subparagraphs of operative paragraph 3, especially those relating to the fissile materials treaty. However, we have been reassured by the response from the delegation of Japan at this morning's meeting. Therefore, Pakistan, as a non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, construes that we are not under any obligation to implement operative paragraph 3, including several of its subparagraphs. That understanding enabled my delegation to abstain rather than vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom): I have asked for the floor to explain the United Kingdom's position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

In my statement this morning in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, I set out the United Kingdom's approach to draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament placed before the Committee. As the time available to us is short, I will refrain from repeating that statement in its entirety but would merely state that the same considerations apply in our approach to this draft resolution. For that reason we were happy to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): The First Committee has just taken a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". In years past my delegation has usually been in a position to support the Japanese approach as being pragmatic and moderate in terms of the process of nuclear disarmament. Today, six months after the adoption of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), it seems to us that any resolutions on the topic of nuclear disarmament must faithfully reflect the balances achieved by consensus during the Conference.

However, the text presented to the Committee today does not, from our perspective, comply with this requirement except in a partial fashion, as regards both the preambular and operative parts. We can only deplore the use of selective quotations from the Final Document. That applies particularly in respect of two essential points: the out-of-context treatment in the preambular part of the question of the unequivocal undertaking by nuclear States to accomplish total nuclear disarmament, and the lack of any explicit

reference to general and complete disarmament in operative paragraph 3. France considers that on these fundamental and inseparable subjects the draft resolution presented by Japan departs markedly from the consensus achieved in New York last May. Therefore, it constitutes an interpretation both of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference, of article VI of the NPT and of the decisions taken in 1995, and we cannot support that. That is why France, while fully committed to discharging all its commitments in terms of disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, was compelled to abstain this year in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Darwish (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". Egypt abstained in the voting, although we support the resolution and associate ourselves with its objectives and noble goals. Indeed, the objective is to totally eliminate nuclear weapons and free the world from them.

However, we are opposed to operative paragraph 8, and that prevented us from voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, although we fully support the objectives of the draft resolution. We would like to thank the delegation of Japan, which cooperated by revising operative paragraph 9 in order to take into account the concerns of some States. It is our hope that the wording of next year's draft resolution will allow us to associate ourselves with the consensus and to support it.

Mr. Baeidi-Nejad (Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran appreciates the efforts made by the Government of Japan to present a more streamlined draft resolution on nuclear disarmament this year, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution lists effective measures towards nuclear disarmament and reflects much of the language of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which in our view strengthens the draft resolution. My country therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

However, we abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, which does not reflect the balanced outcome of the NPT discussions on the issue of regulating nuclear transfers. We are cognizant, in the meantime, of the positive spirit that the delegation of Japan has shown, and this was reflected in the statement made by Japan yesterday when introducing the revised draft resolution. We are therefore confident that there is a very good possibility of introducing a paragraph on this issue in the draft resolution next year based on agreed language that could be supported by all.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation has taken the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. We had a positive view of the efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution in the preparation of the draft, and note the importance of the fact that it reflects measures on nuclear disarmament that were drawn up during the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We were ready to support many of the measures contained in the draft resolution. At the same time, however, our delegation noted that the sponsors of the draft preferred selectively to cite provisions of the Final Document, which, in our view, violates the fragile balance of interests that was achieved through such enormous effort during the Conference.

Thus, the Russian delegation decided to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. At the same time, we believe that there is a need for all countries to focus their efforts on the implementation of the decisions of the NPT Review Conference. We are convinced that we cannot consider one part of the Final Document more important than any other part. As members are aware, we attach importance to the implementation of the decisions reached during the Conference. Therefore, it would be imprudent to support any one part of these decisions while forgetting about other parts. We approve of the implementation of the decisions of the Conference, and we are ready to cooperate constructively in the implementation of the objectives enshrined in the Final Document.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons", because it believes that this is a useful and important draft resolution that refers to a number of the accepted elements of the gains that were achieved at the sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Japanese delegation made great efforts to change the wording of

paragraph 9, which posed certain problems for various delegations, including mine. However, the wording of operative paragraph 8 is ambiguous, and that is why my delegation abstained.

The Algerian delegation hopes that the Japanese delegation will make additional efforts at the next session so that the draft resolution will obtain the greatest support possible.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1. I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): We are taking the floor to explain Pakistan's vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1. Pakistan believes that a ban on the production of fissile material can be promoted only through a universal, non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable treaty negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament. Pakistan was able to support General Assembly resolutions 48/75 L of 1993 and 53/77 I of 1998.

We have agreed to open talks on a fissile materials treaty in the Conference on Disarmament that addresses both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation aspects. As envisaged in the Shannon Report, Pakistan will seek a solution to the problem of existing unequal stockpiles in the course of the negotiations. Pakistan agrees that the Conference on Disarmament should adopt a programme of work that includes negotiations on such a fissile materials treaty. Since the revised draft resolution is consistent with its policy, Pakistan will be happy to join in its adoption without a vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "The Conference on Disarmament decision (CD/1547) of 11 August 1998 to establish, under item 1 of its agenda entitled 'Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament', an ad hoc committee to negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Guatemala, Finland, France, Greece, Grenada, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Kenya, Lithuania, Mali, Malaysia, Monaco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1 because we believe that the objective of a fissile material cut-off treaty is relevant in the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone concept. Israel's approach to that concept was elaborated in our delegation's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". In practical terms assessing the modalities of this draft resolution cannot be done in isolation from the peace process in all its aspects and the overall effort to reduce tensions, curb proliferation and limit armaments in our region.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to make a few brief remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1, which has just been adopted without a vote.

Japan attaches particular importance to the fissile material cut-off treaty and therefore at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) it

stressed its importance, necessity and urgency. The Review Conference agreed on a certain time-frame within which the cut-off treaty negotiations should be completed. Even though we appreciate the efforts of the sponsors, which produced document A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1, it is regrettable indeed that six months after the Review Conference the First Committee could achieve only an agreement falling somewhat short of the outcome of the NPT Review Conference. It is the sincere wish of my delegation that the deletion of the time-line that existed in the original version of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49 should not be construed as a lack of urgency regarding these important negotiations.

I sincerely hope that the current President of the Conference on Disarmament, and its incoming President, will establish a good basis for a smooth start and successful proceedings at next year's session of the Conference on Disarmament. I should like to assure them both of my delegation's full support and cooperation.

The Chairman: We shall now turn to cluster 4. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, conventional weapons, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2.

I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Darwish (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt wishes to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them".

In the eighth preambular paragraph there is a reference to the need to take into account the report of the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) on the proliferation, illicit circulation of and traffic in small arms. While that report reflects the attitude of the Secretary-General of the OAU, a number of African States, including Egypt, expressed reservations about that report during the most recent summit, in Togo.

In view of the noble objective of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2, and its direct link to the provision of assistance for curbing the illicit circulation of and traffic in small arms, the delegation of Egypt will join the consensus on the draft resolution, but we wish to lodge our reservations about the eighth preambular paragraph. This reflects the position we took at the Togo summit. The delegation of Egypt, therefore, does not consider itself to be part of the consensus on that particular paragraph. We ask that our reservation be placed on the record.

Finally, we express our thanks to the delegation of Mali, which showed great understanding of our position in preparing that report. We ask the Secretariat also to take into account the remarks made by the delegation of Mali at this morning's meeting of the First Committee regarding translations from English to Arabic and Arabic to English.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali at the Committee's 27th meeting, on 1 November 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, Mauritania has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now turn to cluster 5.

I call first on those delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 5, regional disarmament and security.

Mr. Ngoh Ngoh (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to speak as the sponsor of the amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34 contained in document A/C.1/55/L.53. As we said when discussing draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34,

entitled "Regional disarmament", the intention was to take account of two different concerns: first, to provide better information about regional efforts made by regional and subregional organizations to disarm and establish confidence-building measures and regional arrangements and facilitate their coordination by the United Nations Secretariat, and also to facilitate the implementation of these efforts through appropriate assistance of the Secretariat to the organizations concerned.

From my delegation's point of view, these concerns, which are in keeping with the objectives set out in the medium-term plan 2002-2005, as well as the guidelines and recommendations concerning regional approaches to disarmament in the context of international security, adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1993 during its substantive session, can have a beneficial effect on regional disarmament and thus on international peace and security.

The draft amendment has received widespread support from members. However, as we pointed out when it was introduced, we were hoping that it would be adopted by consensus. We were also concerned about preserving the consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution as a whole. Intensive consultations to this effect held among sponsors and interested countries revealed that the objective would be best served by the use of specific textual support. We have therefore decided to present a draft resolution on this question at the fifty-sixth session and to withdraw A/C.1/55/L.53. We thank members for the support they have shown for the draft amendment, and all interested delegations for their cooperation during consultations.

Mr. Reznikov (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): When the First Committee began its work at this session there was a feeling States were showing real cooperation in discussing the most complex issues of international security and disarmament. Many States adopted the positive impetus of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), at which it was possible to achieve consensus. I want to demonstrate this with figures. If I am not mistaken — but if I am I would ask the Secretary to correct me — this was clearly visible in the number of officially published revised draft resolutions, of which there were 17, not including official amendments to certain other drafts. There were 17 out of 50. Is that a lot or a little? Compared with last year's session, when there were only six such official revised drafts, there were three times as many at this session. We consider the increased number of such drafts to be a clearly positive trend that shows clearly that many delegations this year are demonstrating a much more constructive spirit and, in a spirit of cooperation, are seeking compromise. The Belarusian delegation has also been guided by that spirit at this session of the General Assembly. Everywhere we are counting on mutual understanding and cooperation. We have attempted, if at all possible, to see that things did not get to a confrontational point. That was the case also in the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee), and in the First Committee. We were sure that reason and reasoned argument must win out since that was precisely what guided us in our relations with our colleagues in determining the positions we held on various issues.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.46/Rev.1 was aimed at supporting the efforts of the entire international community to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones. That noble objective is not being disputed by anyone. The spirit and language of the draft resolution are positive. It has already received consensus support at many disarmament forums. Therefore, we chose it as the basis for our consultations with countries of the region. Our delegation could describe that process in detail. It was not an easy process. It was obvious to everyone that our delegation had demonstrated the maximum possible spirit of compromise here. We took into account all — and I reiterate, all — of the comments made to us by our partners in Central and Eastern Europe, as they can confirm.

At the outset there was only a concern to refer to regions, and then there were wishes to remove references to previous resolutions, et cetera. However, work on the document was such that we came to a point where we were told, "We have no comments on this text, but nevertheless we will not be able to support it." What lies at the basis of such an approach, which we could only call a manifestation of double standards? On the one hand, certain countries yesterday voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, and in particular on the proposals for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, a region where there is no hint of consensus right now regarding the establishment of such a zone. The principle being referred to by our partners in Central and Eastern Europe is the need to

support only regional initiatives on which there is agreement among the countries of the region regarding the establishment of such zones. Those very same countries are also violating or ignoring that principle in the case of another draft resolution. At the same time, these countries are not able to support our draft resolution, which enshrines the fundamental principles reflected in the relevant recommendations of the Disarmament Commission. The only reference to anything regional is contained in the title of the draft resolution.

We deeply regret that the spirit of compromise and cooperation demonstrated by many delegations has, for some individual countries of our region, become an instrument of political prejudice. It would be fair to note here that many countries of the region at the outset were indeed inclined to engage in joint work aimed at achieving consensus. We had hoped that the spirit of genuine compromise and the constructive approach they had displayed would win out. However, we did not expect that, purely for reasons of expediency, the leadership of individual delegations would not take into account the content of the revised draft resolution that has been submitted. Apparently, they remain prisoners of the spirit of the cold war. We cannot allow ourselves such a luxury. We have no doubt that in a vote this draft resolution would receive the overwhelming support of the majority of countries, for which the global objective of achieving peace in a world free of nuclear weapons is important. For our delegation however, it is unacceptable that a draft resolution aimed at supporting the efforts of the international community towards the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones should be held hostage to the political ambitions of certain individual States.

This draft resolution must, we are profoundly convinced, be adopted only by consensus. Consequently, in accordance with rule 122 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, our delegation requests that this draft resolution be withdrawn and that a decision on it not be taken. I should like to thank all States that gave us their support, displayed patience and provided assistance for finding a compromise.

The Chairman: The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34. If no delegations wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will proceed to cluster 6. I call first on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments.

Mr. Abubaker (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of the Arab Group, which the delegation of Libya is chairing this month, has taken the floor in order to make some remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, in connection with the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

The members of the League of Arab States have for some years been expressing their views with regard to the entire matter of transparency in armaments, encompassing as it does the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. These views are clear and well established and are based on a general orientation with respect to international disarmament issues and a particular, regional one that is determined by the specific character of the situation in the Middle East. The following points set forth the Arab position in this regard.

The members of the League of Arab States advocate transparency in armaments as a means of enhancing international peace and security and believe that, in order to be successful, any transparency mechanism must be guided by certain basic principles: it must be balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory — I repeat, balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory — and it must enhance the

national, regional and international security of all States in conformity with international law.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms represents a long-overdue first attempt by the international community to address the transparency issue at a global level. Despite the fact that the potential value of the Register as a global confidence-building measure and early-warning mechanism cannot be questioned, it has encountered a number of problems. Most noticeably, approximately one half of the States Members of the United Nations have consistently refrained from submitting data to the Register.

In this context, the members of the League of Arab States are of the view that the scope of the Register must be expanded — I repeat, the scope of the Register must be expanded — particularly as the experience of past years has shown that the Register, which is limited to seven categories of conventional arms, will not attract universal participation. Numerous States, including the members of the League, do not consider that the Register, given its present limited scope, adequately meets their security needs. The future success of the Register is therefore contingent upon the willingness of the members of the international community to engage in greater transparency and to build greater confidence. In our view, and as envisaged in the Register's founding resolution, General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, an expanded Register including data on advanced conventional weapons, on weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and on high technology with military applications would represent a more balanced, more comprehensive and less discriminatory instrument attracting a larger number of regular participants.

The Middle East region represents a special case in this context, one in which the qualitative imbalance in armaments is striking and in which transparency and confidence can come about only if approached in a balanced and comprehensive way. Applying transparency in the Middle East region to seven categories of conventional weapons while ignoring more advanced, more sophisticated or more lethal armaments, such as weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, is an approach that is neither balanced nor comprehensive. It will not yield the desired results, especially since the Register does not take into consideration the existing situation in the Middle East, where Israel continues its occupation of Arab territories — I repeat, where Israel continues its occupation of Arab territories — maintains its possession of the most lethal weapons of mass destruction and is still the only State in the region that is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as it persists in defying repeated calls by the international community to accede to the Treaty and to place all of its nuclear facilities under the full-scope safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It was this that prompted the States parties to the Treaty, meeting at the 2000 Review Conference, to stress that it was essential for Israel to take these steps.

The members of the League of Arab States regret that the Group of Governmental Experts that was convened in 2000 to consider the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development failed, as had previous meetings of experts, to expand the scope of the Register to include military holdings and procurements from national production and that it also failed to incorporate weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons. This is incompatible with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, by which the Register was established.

This failure indicates the deadlock that has afflicted the operation of the Register and its consequent inadequacy in its present form to function as an effective means of building confidence or as an early-warning mechanism.

In the light of the above, the members of the League of Arab States are of the view that their aforesaid concerns must be addressed effectively and in such a manner as to ensure universal participation in the Register and hence its fulfilment of the role assigned to it as a means of building confidence and an early-warning mechanism that can be relied upon.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Without wishing to do so in reference to this particular draft resolution, I wish to reply to the statement just made. I want to reject forcefully the abuse by the Libyan representative, in the name of the Arab League, of this draft resolution in order to proffer political insults against my country and against its political position and security policy.

There are several questions that are being addressed by at least two other draft resolutions dealing directly with the Middle East, and one of them is a

consensus draft resolution. It is wrong and unfaithful to discuss the need to arrive at a compromise and the need for countries in our region to arrive at a decision accepted by all countries in the framework of a draft resolution that deals with transparency in armaments, a transparency in which many countries of the Arab League refuse to take part by using the excuse of their political position vis-à-vis Israel.

I did not wish to speak on this draft resolution, but the Committee should not be used or abused by delegations to express political insults and assaults against the positions of other countries.

The Chairman: Before we proceed further, I wish to clarify one point with regard to cluster 5. We have taken action on the draft resolution under cluster 5. In that cluster, document A/C.1/55/L.53, which is an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34, and draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.46/Rev.1 have been withdrawn by their sponsors.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution before a decision is taken.

Mr. Darwish (Egypt): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments" I wish to explain the vote of the delegation of Egypt before the voting.

Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L in 1991, which established the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, Egypt has faithfully advocated the principle of transparency in military matters. Egypt has been supportive of the objective underlying the establishment of the Register. From 1991 to 1993, Egypt lent its support to the annual General Assembly resolutions on transparency in armaments, which were adopted without a vote. However, Egypt has abstained in the voting since 1994, when the Group of Experts was unable to reach any agreement on related aspects of the further development of the Register.

For the Register to attain its objectives as a truly significant confidence-building measure, capable of eliminating suspicions and misperceptions and thereby contributing to enhancing security and stability, in our view it should be based on the following requirements. First, it should be a universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory confidence-building measure. Secondly, it should ensure equal rights and obligations for all States. Thirdly, it should address the legitimate security concerns of all States. Fourthly, it should provide the broadest degree of transparency in all fields of armaments in a non-selective manner.

The United Nations Register in its present form may meet the security concerns of certain States, but it does not adequately meet those of Egypt. Only an expanded Register that provides a comprehensive picture and covers in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner the overall military capabilities of States can serve the cause of transparency in armaments. Therefore, we cannot help but conclude that other countries do not share our enthusiasm and wish to limit the transparency exercise to certain categories of conventional weapons, namely those which currently are covered by the United Nations Register. Such an approach is not consistent with agreements reached in 1991 in the General Assembly regarding the early expansion of the Register's scope. Egypt emphasizes the importance of revising and expanding the Register, in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 8 and 11 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, to include weapons of mass destruction, as well as military holdings, procurement through national production, delivery systems, and transfers of other technology, since the objective of establishing the Register is to achieve transparency in all types of armaments and military programmes, and not merely in the export and import of certain types of conventional arms.

The delegation of Egypt is also disappointed by the outcome of the work of the Group of Experts for the year 2000. The Group was unable to reach any agreement on related aspects or further development of the Register, even though various worthy proposals were presented to enable the Register to emerge as a true, effective confidence-building measure. They all fell prey to obstinate insistence on maintaining unchanged the status quo of the Register. It seems, however, only fair to conclude that the main objective of this exercise is simply to consolidate this clearly discriminatory mechanism.

Finally, we emphasize that we are unimpressed by the prospects of the possible eventual development of the Register in terms of expansion of its scope. Such a prospect seems remote in view of the apparent lack of political will on the part of the international community to faithfully embrace the principles and

objectives of transparency or apply them in a comprehensive, non-discriminatory and equitable manner.

For these reasons, the delegation of Egypt will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

We have followed this draft resolution, and the initiative of a conventional arms register, with interest. Pakistan has been submitting data regularly to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. However, we cannot accept operative paragraph 5, especially the provision calling for the convening of yet another panel of experts in 2003. We feel that in view of the fact that the 2000 panel of experts has just concluded its work, rushing to a decision on the establishment of yet another panel is unwarranted. Member States ought to be given time to examine and reflect on the findings of the 2000 panel before deciding on the establishment of a new panel of experts. The Pakistan delegation, therefore, will be constrained to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My Government resolutely supports the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and transparency in military matters as an important confidence-building measure. However, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments", because operative paragraph 7

> "*Invites* the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments".

The Conference on Disarmament has not undertaken any work whatsoever in the field of armaments for many years. As everyone knows, the work carried out by the Conference on Disarmament in this field led to the creation of the Register of Conventional Arms, and with that the Conference exhausted its mandate. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 does not specify what type of new mandate in the field of transparency the Conference on Disarmament could take on. The General Assembly itself has taken charge of, and will continue to take charge of, examining the reports of the groups of governmental experts that review the operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. That is why it would not be fitting for the Conference on Disarmament to continue the type of work on the Register that it undertook in the past.

On the basis of these considerations, my country, as with similar resolutions in past years, will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): My delegation is taking the floor in order to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments". Oman has traditionally supported draft resolutions before the First Committee regarding transparency in armaments. Our position stems from our conviction that the Register is a first step towards greater transparency in armaments, and not an end in itself.

While we attach great importance to the Register, and believe it should be strengthened, we cannot fail to mark some shortcomings of the Register, among which is, first, the fact that it does not address the legitimate concerns of all States. Secondly, it provides for limited transparency in particular areas and even less in others. Thirdly, we believe it is not a comprehensive arms Register. On this basis, we believe there are legitimate concerns not only for the Arab States but also for other States that are Members of the United Nations that usually do not submit any information to the Register. We hope that the authors of this draft will take those considerations and remarks into account in their future drafting and deliberation on the issue.

I conclude by saying that Oman believes the Register is a first step that should enhance greater transparency in arms and security and looks forward to supporting it when certain concerns have been met.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to emphasize its full support for the position of the Arab States members of the League of Arab States concerning the issues of transparency in armaments, as contained in document A/55/299/Add.2/annex II of 16 October 2000, the content of which was conveyed by the representative of Libya as Chairman of the Arab Group earlier in this meeting.

The Syrian Arab Republic emphasizes its support for the tendency towards building an international

community free of the use or threat of use of force and in which the principles of fairness, justice and peace prevail. While we emphasize our readiness to participate in any international effort aimed with goodwill at achieving that objective, we draw the attention of the First Committee to the fact that the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments" does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East region, where the Arab-Israeli conflict is still raging because of the continued occupation by Israel of the Arab territories, its refusal to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions, its acquisition of the most sophisticated and lethal weapons and its capacity to manufacture and stockpile various sophisticated types of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons. All this shows that the transparency claimed by Israel in the field of armaments involves only a very small part of its huge arsenal of sophisticated lethal weapons.

For these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Mr. Baiedi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): My country believes in a comprehensive approach towards transparency in armaments. The process of transparency in armaments has been faced with difficulty in recent years, due to the fact that General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, as the basis of the whole initiative and the main reference for our deliberations on the subject, has not been fully and truly implemented. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, as the only existing active component within this framework, was not supposed to be the only product of the transparency measures but was considered a first step towards initiating such transparency for all kinds of armaments and related technologies, including weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons.

It is unfortunate in this context that the initiation of transparency measures on nuclear weapons has been resisted and discussions on this issue remained deadlocked at the most recent meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts. As a consequence, the development of the Register, which has been an objective since the beginning of the process and was supposed to take place after a few years of the system's operation, is far from being realized. The United Nations Register, which has been in force now for almost a decade, has received relatively modest support. My country has submitted the necessary data and information to the Register, always with the hope that the Register would expand to cover other areas that are highly relevant to our work. That should still be our common objective, and we have high expectations of taking effective steps towards that goal. To make the panel of experts effective we need to change our attitudes towards the subject.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 has not addressed or considered these fundamental elements, which all need to be seriously considered within the overall objective of the promotion of transparency in armaments. My delegation therefore cannot support the draft resolution and will abstain in the voting. However, it expresses its wish that in the course of the coming year more efforts will be made for the submission of a draft that could receive the fullest support of the members of the General Assembly.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I apologize for taking the floor again, but there are several Arab States and only one Israel. Israel is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. Israel also participates faithfully in the United Nations Register, unlike many countries in our neighbourhood. Some countries in this neighbourhood, the Middle East, continue to stockpile weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The issues of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction has been treated in other clusters in the First Committee, and Israel's position regarding the nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East has been made clear. The question of the Middle East is also being taken up by other United Nations bodies.

The Chairman: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Israel, but I call on the representative of Syria on a point of order.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): For the second time the delegation of Israel has taken the floor. In its first intervention it responded to the statement made by the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on behalf of the Arab States. We think that the right of reply as practised in this Committee and in other committees should be made at the end of the meeting. Why is there a violation of the procedures? I do not know under what rule the Israeli delegation is speaking when it is a sponsor. To my mind, the Israeli delegation has no such right. I request clarification, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: I shall respond to that. I have discovered that Israel is a sponsor of this draft resolution. I have called on delegations wishing to explain their vote. The sponsors of the draft resolution cannot explain their votes before the voting.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43.

Separate votes on the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2, 5 (b) and 7 have been requested.

The Committee will first vote on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 are listed in the document itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Burundi, Jamaica, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Senegal and Uzbekistan.

The Committee will now vote on the fifth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

> "*Welcoming further* the note by the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Egypt, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates

The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 was retained by 134 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, which reads as follows:

> "*Endorses* the report of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and the recommendations contained therein".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Egypt, Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 was retained by 136 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative 5 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, which reads as follows:

"*Reaffirms* its decision with a view to further development of the Register, to keep the scope of and participation in the Register under review, and, to that end:

"(b) *Requests* the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2003, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to a decision at its fifty-eighth session".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Egypt, Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 was retained by 135 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, which reads as follows:

"*Invites* the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 was retained by 132 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 as a whole was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba once again has voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments", this year contained in document A/C.1/55/L.43, given the constructive balance it establishes. Cuba participates in the Register and has been doing so since the Register was created. Every year Cuba sends information to the Secretary-General regarding imports and exports for the seven categories of weapons. Our country directly participated in the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, which met in 1994, 1997 and 2000. As we have expressed to the Secretary-General with regard to the maintenance and improvement of the Register, in order for it to remain an effective instrument for strengthening confidence and security among States, it should also include weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons. This would significantly contribute to the universalization of the Register, a goal that becomes more urgent when we note that, rather than growing, the participation of States has decreased in the last two years. Furthermore, although it has been in force for some years now, the number of countries participating in the Register, even in the best year on record, has never exceeded 100.

Weapons of mass destruction cannot be excluded from initiatives taken in favour of greater transparency in armaments. We hope that in the future the Committee will be able to adopt a resolution on the Register that contains an integrated approach to the implementation of the principle of transparency for both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

In spite of our vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, we abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 7 because we feel that the Conference on Disarmament has already carried out and concluded its work on transparency. The decision on whether or not to continue consideration of this subject is entirely up to the Conference itself.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): General Assembly resolution 46/36 L specifies that the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is a

record of legal arms transfers among sovereign States, but it is regrettable that the United States has blatantly disregarded the provisions of that resolution. Every year since 1996 it has registered its arms sales to Taiwan, a province of China, by way of a so-called footnote. Such a practice by the United States has changed the nature of the Register, leading to its politicization. The American sale of arms to Taiwan has seriously violated Chinese sovereignty and grossly interfered in the internal affairs of China. The Chinese Government expresses its resolute opposition to this. The American sale of arms to Taiwan through the Register has objectively created in the United Nations two Chinas, or one China and one Taiwan. That is something that China cannot accept. Given the insistence on this misguided action, since 1998 China has been compelled to suspend its participation in the Register. Since the United States has not rectified that erroneous approach and since the integrity of the Register has not been maintained, it is obviously impossible for China to participate in the Register. Therefore, it is impossible for us to support this draft resolution.

We again call upon the country concerned to rectify its erroneous approach so that the necessary conditions will be created for China to resume its participation in the Register and to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation could not vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments", although my country attaches a great deal of importance to transparency as a confidence-building measure. From this perspective, the report of the experts, while containing some important elements, is still far from reflecting the position of many countries that would like transparency to include other types of weapons. My delegation was not able to support the draft resolution also because it continues to promote transparency through mechanisms defined in operative paragraphs 5 (b) and (c), which in the past have not produced entirely good results and in fact have shown that they have considerable limitations.

My delegation, which supports any effort to bring about a viable, comprehensive and effective mechanism for transparency, considers that the draft resolution, like the report of the experts, focuses only on a Register of conventional weapons and does not take into consideration the oft-expressed need to extend the Register to other categories, in particular weapons of mass destruction, and most notably nuclear weapons and high technology with military applications. We are gratified that this year there is a single text or transparency before the Committee, but we appeal to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43 to take into consideration the concerns of the many delegations that have spoken in order that greater support for this text can be achieved.

Mr. Kyaw Thu (Myanmar): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments". We believe that transparency in armaments can be a useful confidence-building measure provided that it is universal, non-discriminatory and on a voluntary basis. How much transparency in armaments should we exercise? My delegation is of the view that there should also be transparency in weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. We respect the commendable intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but we should also recognize reality.

My delegation has difficulties with regard to some elements in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.43. We have reservations on operative paragraphs 5 (b) and 7. In operative paragraph 5 (b), by which the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2003, my delegation believes that that is too ambitious and premature. Moreover, we do not see the rationale and justification of inviting the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments, as mentioned in operative paragraph 7. The Conference on Disarmament is not yet in a position to agree on a programme of work due to the divergent views on banning fissile materials, nuclear disarmament and security assurances. We should not make a hasty decision on transparency in armaments. I believe we need more time to study this in depth.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 5 (b) and 7 and also on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to take the floor at this stage, the only draft resolution remaining is A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, which has just been

circulated for the Committee's consideration. I call on the delegation of Egypt to introduce the revised draft resolution.

Mr. Darwish (Egypt): It is my pleasure to introduce the revision in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". The revision is to the sixth preambular paragraph. After "nuclear activities," the following words have been added:

> "and underlines the necessity of universal adherence to the Treaty and of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Treaty".

The Egyptian delegation had extensive consultations with all delegations on this revision, which is taken from the language of the resolution adopted during the sixth Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). My delegation therefore requests that the 24-hour rule pertaining to taking decisions on draft resolutions be waived.

The Chairman: Delegations have heard the representative of Egypt. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2 is before the Committee. The 24-hour rule is rule 120 of the rules of procedure, but the Committee is its own master and may dispense with the rule and take action on the draft resolution. Is there any objection to considering draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2 now?

Mr. Mohammed (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): First I should like to state that the draft resolution was submitted by Egypt on behalf of a number of Arab States. Iraq, a member of the League of Arab States, is not among the sponsors. Therefore, my delegation wishes to express strong reservations about the last part of the sixth preambular paragraph in document A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, which, as orally revised, states:

> "and underlines the necessity of universal adherence to the Treaty and of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Treaty".

My delegation has reservations for the following reasons: first, all States of the region except the Zionist entity are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). States that have nuclear facilities or undertake nuclear activities have signed arrangements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and honour their obligations under the safeguards system. The IAEA has never issued any statement to the contrary, and therefore the revision is ambiguous and unwarranted, because the only State that refuses to accede to the Treaty and to place its nuclear facilities under the IAEA safeguards system is the Zionist entity. That entity is developing nuclear weapons with the help of a depositary State of the NPT, namely, the United States of America. Work was supposed to be done to make an explicit reference here to the fact that the assistance by the United States of America to Israel in order to develop its nuclear weapons and to protect that entity from any international action has led Israel not to accede to the NPT. The United States assistance to and cooperation with the Zionist entity in the area of nuclear armaments is well known. Since the February 2000 agreement which would allow nuclear scientists —

The Chairman: I am sorry to interrupt, but delegations should not yet be explaining their position on the substance of the draft resolution. The Committee is considering the procedural aspect and whether we should or should not take up the draft resolution this evening. I therefore ask the representative of Iraq to conclude his statement.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to object to your proposal that we waive the 24-hour rule, but in view of the importance of the revision that has been put before us, I would like to request a brief suspension of the meeting so that the members of the European Union, on behalf of which I speak, may engage in consultations.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Only a week ago the General Assembly waived the 24-hour rule in order to take a decision at the request of the same delegation now calling for the application of the rule. The proposed revision by Egypt is balanced in our opinion. It meets the expectations and wishes of many delegations and accurately reflects the Final Document adopted by consensus at the sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We therefore support the Egyptian proposal that we immediately take up consideration of the draft resolution, the last one before the Committee.

Mr. Baiedi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I think the positions on this draft resolution are rather clear. Revision 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29 has

been on the table since 26 October, and we have been cognizant of the consultations on producing a revised text that would be acceptable to and supported by more parties. I believe, as the representative of Egypt explained, that the basis of the consultations has been the language of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The addition we see in the revised paragraph is again a reflection of the agreement reached at the NPT Conference. We believe that since we are faced with agreed language in this context, a decision on the draft resolution could be made today, without delay. In this context, we support the position of the delegation of Egypt and believe that a proper decision can be made today.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico): May I draw the attention of the Chairman to rule 118, which states,

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote."

I also draw attention to rule 119, which states,

> "Subject to rule 113, the motions indicated below shall have precedence in the following order over all other proposals or motions before the meeting:"

and to suspend the meeting is the first one indicated.

I heard the Ambassador of France asking for a suspension of the meeting. I object to the fact that a debate is going on. Either we suspend the meeting immediately or we vote on the suspension of the meeting. Let us stick to the rules of procedure. It is late enough as it is.

The Chairman: I would also call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we can suspend the meeting, but at the same time, apart from the procedural aspects, we have to take into account the practical aspect. Because of the lateness of the hour it could be rather difficult. If we take up the draft resolution there will be explanations of vote before and after the voting and then we have to proceed with the closure. So from a practical point of view, it is rather difficult to take up the draft resolution this evening.

Instead of going through the procedural motions, if the Committee agrees perhaps we could hold a meeting tomorrow afternoon. I have been informed by the Secretariat that the interpretation services will be available only until 6.30 p.m. That also has to be taken into account.

As the delegation of France has requested, we can suspend the meeting. After that we can decide.

If the Committee agrees I will suspend the meeting for five minutes.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 6 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.

The Chairman: During the suspension I consulted various delegations and also requested the Secretariat to extend the services, including those of interpretation, for this meeting. We now have the conference services at the Committee's disposal.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, I propose that we waive rule 120, the 24-hour rule, and consider the draft resolution at this meeting. If I hear no objection it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I first call upon delegations wishing to make general statements on cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

Mr. Mohammed (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): My remarks will be general regarding draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, submitted by Egypt. My delegation has reservations regarding the draft resolution for the following reasons.

All countries in the Middle East region except the Zionist entity are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Countries that possess nuclear facilities or undertake nuclear programmes have signed safeguards arrangements with the International Atomic Energy Agency. The safeguards are not observed by the Zionist entity, and with the help of the United States of America it is developing nuclear weapons. That is obvious from the nuclear cooperation between the two countries since the signing of their February 2000 agreement. That is

the primary factor preventing universal adherence to the Treaty, and that must be referred to explicitly in the draft resolution. As I indicated, all other countries in the region have acceded to the Treaty and are committed to the safeguards system. Therefore, my delegation wishes to state that Iraq did not join the Arab Group in sponsoring this draft. Had we been allowed to make suggestions we would have suggested a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph, and if that paragraph is put to the vote we will vote against it.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution before a decision is taken.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

My delegation will support the draft resolution, as, in our view, given the title and scope of the draft resolution, its provisions are applicable only to the Middle East region.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): Since the inception of draft resolutions on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, the United States has opposed the texts. This year's version continues the tradition of a one-sided attack on one country in the region and presents an inaccurate picture of the nuclear-weapons-proliferation problem in the region.

Regarding the last-minute revision to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.1, now A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, I would note that while the United States fully supports strict compliance with obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and welcomes recognition of its importance in the region, this addition to an unacceptable draft resolution does not improve it one iota. I also cannot help but note with bemusement that some delegations, unable to support other draft resolutions for their alleged inconsistency with the NPT Final Document, appear to be about to jettison that principle in supporting this draft resolution.

The inaccuracies and omissions in the draft resolution include the following: no mention of one country in the region that has been found to be in non-compliance with the NPT; no mention of the steps being taken by some countries in the region to develop the capability to acquire nuclear weapons, despite being parties to the NPT; no mention of Middle East States that have failed to live up to their NPT obligations to conclude safeguards agreements; and no call on Middle East States to join the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to sign the additional safeguards Protocol with the IAEA.

At the 2000 NPT Review Conference, hard work resulted in agreement on a meaningful statement on nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. That cooperative effort led to the first consensus NPT Review Conference Final Document in years and should be promoted as a model for addressing proliferation in the Middle East. Instead, this draft resolution takes selective passages from the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference, uses them out of context, and distorts the record. That is disappointing and should be unacceptable to the States that have participated in the development of, and have a stake in, the NPT Review Conference Final Document.

We see this draft resolution as a step backwards from the cooperative spirit engendered last May, when we worked together to address our mutual interests in promoting nuclear non-proliferation at the NPT Review Conference. It is also a step away from cooperative efforts to address the applications of safeguards in the Middle East at this year's IAEA General Conference. In sum, the United States believes this draft resolution not only fails to promote non-proliferation in the Middle East but may actually work against that important objective. My delegation will vote against the draft resolution and calls on others to join us in not supporting it. Voting against the draft resolution will send a strong message that unbalanced and partial resolutions are not the best way to address non-proliferation in the Middle East.

Mr. Bar (Israel): The First Committee is again called upon to vote on a draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, a draft resolution that is blatantly one-sided, contentious and divisive and has the potential to undermine rather than enhance confidence among the States of the region.

Since the draft resolution was first presented many developments have occurred in the nuclear realm

in the Middle East, not the least of which is the sombre experience gained by the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) action team. In addition, other efforts are under way to acquire weapons of mass destruction and missile capabilities in the region, as our delegation pointed out during the general debate.

The bias of the draft resolution stems from its neglect of the fact that the real risk of proliferation in the Middle East emanates from countries that, despite being States parties to international treaties, do not comply with their relevant international obligations. Those countries are engaged in ongoing efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, efforts that have a dangerously destabilizing effect not only in the region but on the global scale as well. Adopting a draft resolution that does not reflect this reality will not serve the greater objective of curbing proliferation in the Middle East.

This draft resolution focuses entirely on one country that has never threatened its neighbours or abrogated its obligation under any disarmament treaty. Moreover, it singles out Israel in a manner that no other United Nations Member State is being singled out in the First Committee. Singling out Israel in this manner is counter-productive to confidence-building and peace in the region and does not lend this body any dignity. The constructive approach demonstrated during the deliberations on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East" is strongly undermined by the introduction of this biased draft resolution. Resolutions regarding the complex arms control reality in the Middle East should focus on objective ways to address the problems as they exist.

Although we find the approach embodied in the draft resolution objectionable, the text submitted for the entire consideration of the First Committee this year has undergone a series of changes, which has resulted in even harsher language directed at Israel. The use of language which purports to represent, in an unbalanced way, part of the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) undermines the internal compromise which that document was based upon. That remains true despite the reference, made in the new revision just presented by the Egyptian delegation, to the need for NPT member States to strictly comply with their obligations under that Treaty. It is for us to guess which member State or States in the Middle East they might have had in mind. That for some countries this reflects a balanced reflection of the NPT Review Conference is a source of very great disappointment for us.

The First Committee should not become a venue for political discrimination. We call upon representatives to vote against the draft resolution in order to demonstrate disapproval of singling out Israel and this approach as a whole.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2.

A separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph has been requested.

The Committee will first vote on the sixth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 28th meeting, on 1 November 2000, on behalf of some States Members of the United Nations that are members of the League of Arab States. In addition, Afghanistan has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now vote on the sixth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

> "*Recognizing with satisfaction* that, in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Conference undertakes to make determined efforts towards the achievement of the goal of universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and calls upon those remaining States not party to the Treaty to accede to it, thereby accepting an international legally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all their nuclear activities, and underlines the necessity of universal adherence to the Treaty and

of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Treaty".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Cuba, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Tonga

The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2 was retained by 138 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Tunisia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United

Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Canada, India, Marshall Islands, Singapore, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2 as a whole was adopted by 139 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Gambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes.

Mr. Mukul (India): The Indian delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". India abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against the sixth preambular paragraph, which makes a reference to the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, on which our position is well known. Besides, we believe that the focus of the draft resolution should necessarily be limited to the region it purports to address. India considers that the multifarious issues addressed in the draft resolution have received widespread consideration in the international community and hopes that progress will be made on the issues involved in the coming years through positive contributions by the States concerned of the region.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Iceland, as a country of the European Free Trade Association and member of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this statement.

The European Union, as in previous years with similar draft resolutions, voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East". It did so taking fully into account the new element represented by the adoption six months ago of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which should be implemented in all of its aspects.

Mr. Kongstad (Norway): I have asked for the floor to make an explanation of Norway's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.2. We acknowledge the threats posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons to international and regional security and stability and fully share the commitment to nuclear disarmament, with the ultimate goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. In this regard, we welcome and support the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Like other States, Norway believes that initiatives leading to substantive disarmament in the Middle East would greatly enhance peace and security in the region. Agreement on a comprehensive model for disarmament and non-proliferation in the Middle East could be an important step towards this goal. We believe that such a model, to be effective, should include all weapons of mass destruction, be balanced and be based on transparency. To achieve this we think it is important that no parties are singled out and that all parties strictly comply with commitments made to existing, relevant treaties.

In the past Norway has not been able to support draft resolutions on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East because it felt that the text was unbalanced and addressed only a selective part of the issue. We do not see this as being an adequate and constructive approach to the complex situation in the Middle East region. This year the draft resolution, with the addition introduced in revision 2 by the delegation of Egypt, includes an essential element by recognizing the necessity of strict compliance by all parties with their obligations under the NPT. That is an important step in the right direction towards addressing this issue in a more comprehensive way and taking into account the situation in the region in its totality. We want to encourage that approach, and therefore found it possible to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, the First Committee has thus concluded the final phase of its work, namely, action on all draft resolutions and decisions on disarmament and international security issues, as scheduled.

Conclusion of the third stage of the Committee's work

The Chairman: In accordance with the First Committee's practice, I shall now give the floor to the representatives of the regional groups.

Mr. Lagdhaf (Mauritania) (*spoke in French*): After a few weeks of intensive work we are now closing the work of the First Committee, having concluded consideration of all the items on our agenda. On behalf of the African Group I should like to thank the Chairman for the wisdom, patience and responsibility with which he guided the work of the Committee. My thanks also go to the members of the Bureau for their readiness and willingness throughout our session. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs and the Secretariat at large for the quality of the documents provided to us. They were very useful and greatly facilitated our work. I should also like to thank the interpreters for their help in sometimes difficult moments. Without their assistance we could not have finished our work within our deadline. I thank all the members of the Committee for the serious manner in which they contributed positively to the debate. We have worked untiringly to adopt draft resolutions that, I hope, will further the cause of disarmament and international peace and security. Today more than ever before, at the beginning of the millennium, we must pursue with determination the efforts already under way to achieve our common goal, a world of peace and security.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): I indicated to the Secretariat that at the end of our proceedings we would like to speak in order to thank the Chairman on behalf of the member States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and other States associated with the Movement, and to extend our appreciation to him, a fellow member of the Movement, for the professional way in which he guided the work of the First Committee, enabling us not only to successfully adopt many important disarmament and international security resolutions but also to conclude our work ahead of schedule, albeit at this late hour.

We would also like to thank the members of the Bureau, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Dhanapala and his staff, the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, and the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, for their role in assisting delegations in our consideration of draft resolutions considered by the Committee. Last, but not least, we would also like to thank the interpreters and translators, who have been essential in the Committee's work.

Mr. Petrič (Slovenia): On behalf of the countries of the Eastern European Group, which Slovenia has the honour to chair for the month of November, I wish to extend our appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to other members of the Bureau for the efforts you have made in order to bring the work of the First Committee to its final, successful and timely conclusion. Our gratitude goes also to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, to the Secretary of the First Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, and to many others whose counsel and advice greatly contributed to the success of this exercise.

I should like to pay tribute and express appreciation to all the staff of the Secretariat — interpreters, translators and conference officers — who behind the scenes effectively supported the work of the Committee by carrying out their responsibilities in an excellent and professional manner, which undoubtedly helped to ensure the success of the Committee in completing its work.

Mr. Seibert (Germany): I have the honour to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and to thank you on behalf of the Group of Western European and other States, for the admirable and efficient way in which you guided our work during the past few weeks. Your diplomatic skill and experience have helped us to deal expeditiously and non-confrontationally with the issues before us and even to conclude our work ahead of schedule.

We also want to congratulate and thank the other members of the Bureau and the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, and all the members of the Secretariat. We also wish to express our appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Dhanapala, as well as Mr. Petrovsky and Mr. Bensmail, Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on

Disarmament, for their presence and assistance in our work.

The relaxed, good-humoured style of your leadership, Mr. Chairman, was perfectly adapted to the working atmosphere of this year's session of the First Committee, which was more constructive and less confrontational than in earlier years. Had it been otherwise, I am sure you would have equally lived up to all challenges. We can congratulate ourselves on the fact that this was not necessary.

Last, but not least, we wish to express our deep appreciation to the interpreters, translators, conference officers and all the other staff for their unfailing support to representatives and the excellent work they have done.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): As we come to the end of the work of the First Committee, I should like to say a few brief words on behalf of the European Union, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union, the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, and Iceland and Norway as members of the European Free Trade Association and the European Economic Area.

We extend to you, Mr. Chairman, our most sincere congratulations on the effective manner in which you guided the work of the Committee during the past five weeks, which allowed it today to conclude within the time allotted to it. We would also like to extend our congratulations to the Secretariat team, which was able to meet the needs of all delegations, and, in particular, to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, whose experience and pleasant calm were most useful to us.

In addition, I would be remiss if I did not also thank our excellent interpreters, whom we have sorely tried, the entire team of translators, which, as usual, worked its miracles, and the conference officers, who provided indispensable logistic support.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize our appreciation of the positive, cooperative atmosphere that characterized relations among delegations during this session of the First Committee. It is our hope that the spirit of cooperation will continue through to our next session.

Ms. Tokhtokhodjaeva (Kyrgyzstan): It is a great honour and privilege for me, in my capacity as Chairman of the Asian Group for the month of November 2000, to welcome on behalf of the Asian Group the successful conclusion of this session of the First Committee.

I have the honour to congratulate our colleagues, all the delegations in the First Committee, on the conclusion of our work as scheduled. I should like to express the deepest gratitude for the very efficient and admirable way in which you, Mr. Chairman, have conducted our deliberations and brought them to a successful conclusion. Our appreciation also goes to all the members of the Bureau and the Secretary of the Committee. We are grateful to the Secretariat for its outstanding work during the session. We, the member States of the Asian Group, are also thankful for the close cooperation we have enjoyed working with all the Member States of the Organization.

Mr. Cordeiro de Andrade Pinto (Brazil): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States in order to express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members of the Bureau, for the way in which you have led our work. Thanks to your guidance we were able to deal expeditiously with all agenda items before us and to conclude our work ahead of schedule.

The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States would also like to express appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, to the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, to the Secretary of the First Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-chung, and to all members of the Secretariat. Along with other regions, we are grateful to all the interpreters and translators. In the case of Latin America, a special word of gratitude should be conveyed to the interpreters and translators of Spanish.

The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States wishes also to put on record its heartfelt thanks for the dedication of the conference officers and the members of the First Committee secretariat sitting behind you, Sir, who have been indispensable to our work.

At this millennium session of the Assembly, the First Committee is concluding its work successfully, thanks to the efforts of all those mentioned and to the spirit of cooperation that prevailed among delegations. The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States

looks forward to the opportunity of working constructively with everybody again.

Mr. Abubaker (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the conclusion of the work of the First Committee, may I, on behalf of the Arab Group, say that I am pleased to express deep thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for the efforts you have made in guiding our deliberations this year. You demonstrated a constructive spirit, diligence and patience. Your efforts have yielded the desired results at the end of our session. This undoubtedly has provided impetus for the achievement of our common goal: finding a world that is free of nuclear weapons, a world where peace prevails.

On behalf of the member States of the Arab League, I should also like to express our thanks to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, to all the staff of the Secretariat for our conference services, and to all members of delegations for the organizational skills that facilitated the work of the Committee.

Mr. Darwish (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of the delegation of Egypt, I should like to thank the States that voted in favour of the draft resolution on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. Our thanks also go to delegations that showed flexibility in order to allow the First Committee to adopt that draft resolution at today's meeting.

The delegation of Egypt would also like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Bureau, for your skilful stewardship of the First Committee during this fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly. We would also like to thank all the Secretariat staff for their efforts during this fifty-fifth session.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): It is an honour for me to speak on behalf of the member States of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). I wish to take this opportunity to express our deepest gratitude and appreciation for the efficient and able way in which you, Mr. Chairman, have guided the work of the First Committee to a successful conclusion. We are particularly impressed by the high standards and discipline you have applied to the work of the Committee this year. We are gratified that this has helped the Committee to deal fully with its heavy workload earlier than expected. Our sincere thanks also go to the other members of the Bureau and to the Secretariat staff, whose help has facilitated our work greatly.

The delegations of the ASEAN countries are also very thankful for the spirit of cooperation displayed by all other delegations to the First Committee. May I wish you, Sir, and the Bureau all the best.

The Chairman: I call now on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): As we conclude our work, I believe that all members of the Committee are anxious to know when all the draft resolutions that have been adopted here will be taken up in plenary meeting. As a result of consultations with the Conference Services and General Assembly Affairs branch, the tentative date for all draft resolutions adopted in the First Committee to be taken up for adoption in the plenary General Assembly is Monday, 20 November. However, I must underline that the date is tentative and depends on the reports of the First Committee.

At this juncture, I wish to make a few short, personal remarks. As time passes, I am approaching the end of my career at the United Nations. In other words, I shall be gone next March for good. During the past 23 years in the field of disarmament I have served as the Secretary or Secretary-General of various multilateral disarmament forums on a variety of subjects, forums such as the Working Group on security assurances and radiological weapons of the Conference on Disarmament in the early 1980s, expert groups, and international conferences on different subjects; I have served as Secretary of the Disarmament Commission for 10 years and as Secretary-General of review conferences on the Seabed Treaty, the Environmental Modification Convention, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), and so on, and lastly, as Secretary of the First Committee for the past five years.

For all those occasions during past years when chairmen, rapporteurs and delegations have expressed their thanks and kind words to the secretariat and to me personally, and since this is my last session at the United Nations, I feel duty-bound to take this opportunity to reciprocate and to put on record my sincere thanks to all chairmen, members of the Bureau and delegations for their friendly and kindly words addressed to me in the past.

For the past 23 years the achievements in the field of disarmament have been up and down as the international political environment has changed — more or less in a 10-year cycle, as I personally observed. A historic agreement on all disarmament issues was reached in the late 1970s, as reflected in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament in 1978, and then serious concern about a nuclear arms race and the danger of nuclear war overwhelmed international relations during the 1980s. The post-cold-war era turned out to be a golden age of arms control and disarmament, with the conclusion of START I and START II, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the CTBT. Consequently, the goal of nuclear disarmament has become the priority issue, although to me, from an academic point of view, it seems to be a philosophical question. Nevertheless, the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the CTBT were considered "mission impossible" during the 1980s. But today that remote hope has turned into a reality. Therefore, as a personal wish, when the philosophical question of nuclear disarmament some day turns into a reality through the concerted efforts of the entire international community, again the mission will be complete, as in previous cases. There is a popular Chinese saying that while the prospects are bright the road to the goal always has twists and turns.

Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, for your excellent work as Chairman of the Committee. Under your able guidance the Committee concluded its work successfully and smoothly, with efficiency and discipline, and in a businesslike manner. On a personal note, I also express my sincere thanks for your friendship, understanding and kindness over the past year in our work together in the Committee.

The Chairman: I thank the Secretary of the Committee for his optimistic prediction regarding nuclear disarmament and other arms control measures.

Statement by the Chairman

The Chairman: We have successfully completed our work. This is the crowning moment of the millennium session of the First Committee. On the whole, we have had a fruitful session of the First Committee this year. The meetings of the Committee over the past five weeks took place in a positive, constructive and cordial atmosphere. Compared to those of previous years, the deliberations and discussions in the Committee this year were less heated, less confrontational and less acrimonious.

The successful outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) had a positive impact on the work of the Committee. Nuclear and space issues once again dominated the deliberations and discussions in the First Committee this year. At the same time, the issues addressed by the Committee were balanced, for the issue of small arms was very much at the forefront of the deliberations in the Committee. Other conventional arms control issues, such as anti-personnel mines and transparency in armaments, were also extensively covered in the deliberations of the Committee.

The directives of the Millennium Declaration on disarmament matters and their implementation were the central themes that underpinned the statements and thematic discussions by all participating delegations, as well as the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee. At this year's session of the First Committee, the three draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament — those entitled "Nuclear disarmament", "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda" and "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons" — underwent perceptible changes and became more flexible and forward-looking. They embraced many positive elements from the agreed text of the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. It is also encouraging to note that these three draft resolutions won wider support in the Committee this year, reflecting the growing support for nuclear disarmament on the part of the international community.

The Committee also underscored the importance of the NPT by adopting a draft resolution welcoming the positive outcome of the 2000 NPT Review Conference by an overwhelming majority. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones constitutes an important measure of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament within the specified geographical areas, and contributes to international peace and security. We took note of the commendable endeavours by the Central Asian countries to finalize work on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in their region.

One of the important arms control measures closely related to nuclear disarmament is the issue of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. Within the framework of providing nuclear security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, we welcome and commend the joint statement by the five nuclear-weapon States providing such assurances to Mongolia. The Committee has once again emphasized the need for renewed efforts by each of the States parties to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty to preserve and strengthen it as the cornerstone of strategic stability. We have also taken an incremental but significant step on the question of missiles. The Secretary-General has now been asked to prepare, with the assistance of a panel of governmental experts, a report for the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

With regard to the Biological Weapons Convention, member States were unanimous in urging strongly that negotiations on a draft protocol on a verification regime be finalized before the Fifth Review Conference, scheduled to take place in Geneva in November 2001.

Member States have sounded a clarion call to combat the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. We need to move fast to ensure the positive outcome of the 2001 United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. It is essential that we resolve all the procedural issues without delay so that there will be sufficient time to achieve consensus on the substantive matters. I earnestly hope that the next session of the Preparatory Committee in January 2001 will make further strides in paving the way for the success of the Conference.

Promising and positive steps have been taken to counter the devastating impact of mines. Member States have also underscored the importance of expanding adherence to the two relevant existing legal instruments. On the subject of transparency in armaments, I note that this year there was now only one draft resolution, not two resolutions as had been the case for the past several years. I hope that this positive development will contribute to further advances on transparency issues.

Emerging issues did not escape the close scrutiny of the First Committee either. One such issue was that of information security. The Committee adopted a draft resolution on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, without a vote.

One of the very important draft resolutions adopted by the First Committee this year was the draft resolution on a fissile material cut-off treaty. For the past couple of years the First Committee has been unable to adopt a consensus resolution on such a treaty. This year we have been able to adopt a consensus resolution on it. I believe that this will send an important political signal to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to overcome the current impasse at its 2001 session.

In talking about the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, I recall that on 31 August 2000 I made an impromptu statement at the Conference on Disarmament in which I narrated a story from the folklore of Asia about the fertility cult. I hope that in the tradition of that story, the current President and the incoming President of the Conference on Disarmament will be able to impregnate the Conference on Disarmament with new ideas and initiatives that will pave the way towards reaching consensus on a programme of work and towards starting negotiations and substantive work in the Conference on Disarmament early in 2001.

I believe that one of the most urgent messages that rang out loud and clear from the deliberations and draft resolutions of the First Committee this year, is the following: it is imperative that in 2001 we overcome the current impasse in the Conference on Disarmament and immediately start negotiations on a cut-off treaty and commence substantive work on other agenda items. This will be a turning point for the Conference on Disarmament as well as for international efforts for arms control and disarmament in other international forums. The challenge before us is how to translate this positive atmosphere and political impetus into concrete results in other disarmament forums, particularly in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Let us do our utmost to make this happen.

I have been so much inspired by the smooth proceedings of the First Committee that I hope you will allow me to indulge in some poetical flights.

Millennium Assembly, once in a lifetime,

With the peoples of all countries, creeds and climes. Now it is high time to halt the excessive accumulation of arms

And carry forward the systematic and progressive process to disarm.

In the millennium First Committee there was less acrimony.

We proceeded with a cooperative spirit and harmony.

We reaffirmed our unequivocal undertaking for nuclear weapons' total elimination,

For there can be no other absolute guarantee against the horrible scourge except their complete annihilation.

We also remain committed to ban

BWs, CWs and other WMDs with systematic plans.

Anti-personnel mines, small arms and weapons light

We strive to control strict and tight.

We also decide to convene SSOD-IV,

To reach consensus on issues of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and more.

We must move first to place a ban on fissiles,

Nor do we forget to deal with the ABM and the issue of missiles.

We have shared a common vision

That we will strive to achieve with determination.

Our vision is the world free from nuclear-weapons' horrors,

Which is also emancipated from the scourge of other mass-destructive weapons' terror.

We want to bequeath a safer world to generations to come.

That is the task lying ahead of us that needs to be done.

I wish to tell you one more thing from the podium:

In a way disarmament is like opium.

I can make one prediction:

Once you are actively involved in disarmament it will become an addiction.

When you retire you are no longer distinguished, or no longer a delegate,

You will still remain disarmament advocates.

Your good selves for the invaluable contribution you have made,

To a higher plane of existence and greatness the fates will surely elevate.

As a matter of fact, composing English poems ought to be the responsibility of the delegation of the United Kingdom. Many years ago I used to attend the Third Committee, where it is a fine tradition that on the final day of the session the United Kingdom representative would read out an English poem. Now that I have volunteered this year to do that in the First Committee, I hope that, beginning next year, the representative of the United Kingdom will take over the responsibility to compose and read out an English poem on the final day, for this honour rightly belongs to the United Kingdom representative, who is indeed recognized as a defender of the purity of the English language.

On a personal note, as Chairman of the First Committee, I should like to thank all members of the First Committee most sincerely for the cooperation they have extended to me during this session. It was indeed a great honour and privilege for me to work with people so distinguished and knowledgeable in the field of disarmament. I wish to thank you all for your commendable efforts. I also wish to express my deep appreciation to the Vice-Chairpersons of the Committee, Mr. Alberto Guani of Uruguay, Mr. Abdelkader Mesdoua of Algeria and Ms. Petra Schneebauer of Austria, and to the Rapporteur, Mr. Rastislav Gabriel of the Slovak Republic. I am very grateful for their assistance.

Let me, on behalf of the Committee, offer most sincere thanks and profound gratitude to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, and also the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services, Mr. Jin Yongjian, the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky and Mr. Lin Kuo-chung and all his staff members in the Secretariat for their valuable assistance. I want to thank especially all the young people behind me who scout for information and

agreements. I thank them all for the good job they have done.

I pay particular tribute to Dr. Lin Kuo-chung, who has worked tirelessly for the Committee during this session. Mr. Lin is a distinguished and dedicated United Nations official who has rendered his services in various international conferences and meetings on disarmament for nearly quarter of a century. He will be retiring early next year. We wish you, Mr. Lin, every success in your new endeavours, and all the best.

Finally, I also wish to extend a special word of thanks to our interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, conference officers and document officers, who have been so patient with us, and to the sound engineers and all those others who worked behind the scenes to bring the work of the Committee to a successful conclusion. Once again I offer my profound thanks to you all for the cooperation without which we would not have been able to accomplish what we did at this millennium session of the First Committee. To those who are flying back to Geneva and to their respective capitals, I say bon voyage. I wish all a happy new millennium and all the best.

I now declare the millennium session of the First Committee closed.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.